

Just Publish'd the Second Edition of

A Preservative against Atheism and Infidelity, in Three Books, I. Proving the Existence of a God, a Providence, and the Immortality of the Soul. II. The Necessity of a Religion Reveal'd by God. III. That the Jewish and Christian Religion were Reveal'd by God: With an Introduction shewing the Causes, pernicious Effects, and Cure of Infidelity. By *Peter La Touch*, Gent. Price bound 3 s. 6 d.

The Miscellaneous Remains of Cardinal *Perron*, President *Thuanus*, Monsieur *St. Evremont*, and Mr. *Chevreau*, In 2 Vol. 1st. Of Conversation, of solid Study, of the Knowledge of the World, of Religion, of Flattery, of human Frailty, a Conversation with two Travellers. 2^d, Of Justice, several Letters serious and pleasant; of Devotion, of impious Men, of the Debauchery of the times, a Word of Eloquence, of Painting, a pleasant and curious Description of *Paris*. Price 5 s. all Printed for *S. Butler*.

THE
MYSTERY
OF 4324 b. 27
ANABAPTISM
UNMASK'D;

Being a full VINDICATION of
INFANT BAPTISM

In the Church of *England*,
IN ANSWER

To the fallacious Arguments, and
pernicious Errors of Mr. *Morgan*,
Mr. *Stennet*, and other the Principal
Leaders of the *Anabaptists*.

To which are Added,

DISCOURSES, I. Upon the Christian
Sabbath, II. Original Sin, III. Forms of Prayer
and our Liturgy, IV. Sinfulness of Schism,
V. The Danger of Apostacy, VI. the History of
the Anabaptists from their first Appearance in
the World in foreign Parts, and in *England*.

By MARIUS D'ASSIGNY, B. D.

L O N D O N,

Printed for S. Butler at Bernard's-Inn-Gate in Holborn,
and sold by J. Morphew near Stationer's-Hall, 1709.

THE
MYSTERY
OF
ANABAPTISM
UNMASKED;

Being a full vindication of
Infant Baptism

in the Church of England,
IN ANSWER

To the following Arguments, and
pernicious Errors of Mr. Morgan,
M. D. and of the English
Trinitarian Society.

By
DISCOVERED: I Open the Christian
Sabbath, I Open the Lord's Day,
and the Lord's Day of the Lord's Day,
the Lord's Day of the Lord's Day,
the Lord's Day of the Lord's Day,
the Lord's Day of the Lord's Day.

By MARTIN D. ASSINGTON, B. D.

LONDON:
Printed by A. & C. Black, 10, St. Paul's Church-yard,
in the Strand, 1844.

TO THE
Right Reverend Father in God,
HENRY
Lord Bishop of *London*.

My Lord,



HE Divine
Truths, and
the Cause of
God and Re-
ligion, that I maintain
A 3 against

The Dedication.

against a pernicious and heretical Sect, have encourag'd me to lay before Your Lordship, and humbly to present to You my Vindication of our Orthodox Doctrines and Practices in this Controversy; and the rather, because Your Lordship hath always declared Your self a noble Patron of our Church and its Evangelick Principles, and an eminent Defender

The Dedication.

fender of its Rights and Holy Orders, against all Opposers in the worst of Times ; I am therefore persuaded that this my Design and Endeavours to discover to the World the Errors and mischievous Purposes of this *Mystery of Anabaptism*, that strikes at the Honour and Being of the Episcopal Function and Clergy, and overthrows all Christianity amongst

The Dedication.

us, cannot but be grateful to so much holy Zeal, Prudence and Care for the Glory of our Redeemer, as have constantly appear'd in Your Lordship's Life and Actions.

If this my Performance may be so happy to meet with Approbation in Your Lordship's Judgment, to answer the End for which it is intended, namely
to

The Dedication.

to justify our Church's reasonable and sacred Belief, and Practices, and be able to silence Gain-sayers, I shall obtain my principal Purpose in this Address.

May the Divine Providence continue Your Lordship many Years amongst us, for the Glory of God, the Good of his Church, and the Salvation of Souls, and after this mortal Race, and

The Dedication.

the faithful Discharge of
Your great Trust, may
Your Immortal Being
be welcom'd into the Joy
of our Lord ; this shall
ever be the Prayer of

Your Lordship's

Most Humble,

Most Obedient,

And dutiful Servant,

MARIUS D' ASSIGNY.

THE

THE PREFACE.

THE intolerable Insolence of this Pernicious Sect, that dares bid publick Defiance to the plainest and most express Truths of the Gospel, contradict the Spirit of God, and whisper about, and amongst their Proselytes apparent Falsities, has oblig'd me to pull off the Mask of this Mystery of Satan, and to shew it to the World without its counterseit Disguise, in its true Shape and Features; for that Purpose I have examin'd its most celebrated Authors, and answer'd their Principal Objections against Infant Baptism, and our Mode of Sprinkling, and prov'd both to be agreeable with holy Scripture, and the Mind and Commands of our Blessed Redeemer. I have likewise here confirm'd my Eight Arguments of my first Antidote, and shew'd the Insignificance of Mr. Morgan's Exceptions against them; and because Mr. Baxter hath in his Book of plain Scripture Proof
for

The PREFACE.

for Infants Church-Membership, several mighty Reasons to evidence the Right of Infants to the Ordinance of Baptism, I have abbreviated and contracted his Arguments, and added them to the former; and for our Mode of Sprinkling, I cannot but wonder that so many learned Men have mistaken the Scripture Meaning of the Greek Word βαπτίζω, and yielded to our Adversaries, that its natural Signification is to dip, whereas from the Beginning of Genesis to the End of the Revelations, and in all the Apocrypha, 'tis not understood by the Spirit of God in that Sense, but for Sprinkling and Washing: I have perhaps more fully examin'd this Question and important Truth than any before me; It concerns us to take a particular Notice of this Observation, for this is one of their chief Objections with which they deceive the Ignorant People, to draw them to Apostacy from our Church, by persuading them that our Mode of Baptism is not conformable to Christ's Institution, and that without a total Immersion they cannot be Christians. By this diabolical Insinuation they cause them to renounce their first lawful and evangelick Baptism with the Benefits then receiv'd from the Divine

THE PREFACE.

vine Mercy by the Hands of the lawful Ministers to be dipped into their Sect, and to embrace their pernicious Errors, and thereby confirmed in their Separation from our Church and Communion, and in their Aversion to our Worship, from which they run, as from a publick Infection; so strange an Influence their Leaders have upon the Minds of their bewitched Profelytes. Some of them have been known within a few Tears to have been zealously affected to the Church of England, and now since their Engagement in this sect seem to hate and abominate both our Persons and Communion, they shun our publick Devotions, and refuse to be present at the Prayers for the Sick, or any other Offices of our Chureh. Many of these deluded People are thus carried away by the Devil's Artifices, and continually loading us and our Ministry with Reproaches and false Accusations, and some are guilty of plain Blasphemy against God and his Divine Truths; to prove this Charge, I appeal to the Writings of Joseph Taylor, where he seems in expresse Words to prefer Mahomet and his abominable Religion to Christ and Christianity. I appeal to the Books of Matth. Cassin, and Tho. Monk, where we may read Arianism, Socinianism, and
the

The PREFACE.

the worst of Heresies publish'd by these ignorant and extravagant Mechanicks, who pretend to understand the Holy Scriptures better than all the Orthodox Churches of Christ and his lawful Ministers; divers of them have now left their Trades and Shops, and cast away their Tools to teach in their Meetings, and command over the Consciences and Purses of such silly Wretches as have abandoned themselves to the Conduct of these Agents of Satan: I confess some of this Sect may be good moral and well meaning Men, who have been deluded into this erroneous Persuasion; but I have observed generally Hypocrisy to reign amongst them, and that they affect a plausible Behaviour, a pretended Sweetness, Humility, Goodness, Charity and Kindness in the Eyes of the World, to conceal the foulest Designs, Actions, Immoralities, and Heresies; so that to understand an Anabaptist truly, we must pull off his Hypocritical Vizard, with which he cosens the ignorant World, and deceives them into a favourable Opinion of his Person, Belief, and Sect; one would think when he pleads from us for a charitable Judgment of himself and Dissenting Party, that he intends to shew that good Example by a civil and kind Opinion of the Practices and Persuasions of those that
are

The P R E F A C E.

are contrary to him ; but how opposite this is to their constant Dealing among themselves, the Reproaches and bitter Invectives of the Cassinites and the Monkists against one another in their printed Books, can sufficiently evidence ; now if they are so furiously bent against their own Brethren, as to condemn them to the Gallows, to the Fire, and to Hell for small Differences in their Judgments about God's Decrees, Predestination, the Divine and Human Natures of Christ, and other mysterious Matters which neither of them understand, what Treatment are we to expect from these charitable Souls, we who are opposite to them as Light is to Darkness : Truly their secret Whisperings amongst our People of their pernicious Principles, their ridiculing the Ordinances of God, their vilifying of our Functions and Ministry, the many scandalous Reproaches and Blasphemies cast upon our Administrations and Worship of God, and their declaring our Baptism a Nullity, and our Persons no Christians, are sufficient Evidences of their Charity for us who cannot be of their Persuasion : Now what Measures ought we in reason to observe with this Sect, that has publicly declar'd open War against us, and are privately undermining our Church and Government,

The PREFACE.

ment, to blow all up at once? Are we to treat them as Christians who have abjured their first Christianity, and are Apostates to our Church? Are we to cherish this viperous Brood in our Breasts, and warm them in our Bosoms, while they are stinging us to Death? Are we to call them Brethren and Friends at that Moment they murder our Reputations, and deny us our Right and Title to our holy Profession; such unseasonable Civility and charitable Behaviour is altogether unreasonable to be expected from us, and would savour of the like Hypocrisy that is remarkable and visible in these demure Professors; and as some Diseases are increas'd by mollifying Salves and sweet Receipts, and Lenitives, this Heresy of the Anabaptists is not to be cured by favourable Concessions, charitable Allowances, gracious Expressions, and kind Appellations, which are more likely to confirm these unadvised and ignorant Souls in their grievous Mistakes, than to persuade them out of them, as we have found by Experience; let not the Christian Reader therefore be offended at my plain Dealing with them, I advance nothing but what is agreeable with Truth, Reason, and holy Scripture, and I am sure I have the blessed

Exam-

THE PREFACE.

Example of Christ and his Prophets and Apostles to warrant my Proceedings, for we find them treating the same sort of Men in the same manner without Flattery, which is not proper in this Case; 'tis true they have a Toleration from our wise Government, but if they did not abuse this kind Allowance, as really they do, secretly to overthrow both Church and State, they would not be so worthy of Blame as really they are. Our reverend Bishops and the Body of the Church of England, have consented to this Toleration; but what ungrateful Returns they have made to us for such a Kindness, let the World judge, they have degraded the sacred Episcopal Order by giving the Name of Bishops to their mechanick Teachers; that venerable Name and Function revered by the Heathens, as by all Antiquity, has by them been thus vilify'd and under-valued; in a word, the whole ministerial Order in Christ's Church amongst us is blown up, and destroy'd, and we and our People are declared by these charitable Friends, these grateful Souls, in Requital of all our Allowances and publick Grants, to be no Christians. This is the evident and publick Declaration of this Mystery of Anabaptism, as I shall make it appear more at large. I must therefore

THE PREFACE.

fore take the Liberty to lay open its pernicious Errors without Dissimulation and Flattery; and because divers of their chief Teachers are Jewish Sabbatarians, Pelagians, &c. I have thought convenient to recommend to the Publick some short Discourses upon our Christian Sabbath, and Original Sin, to prevent the popular Errors upon those two Topicks; upon Forms of Prayer, and our excellent Liturgy, upon the Sinfulness of Schism, and the Danger of Apostacy, and revolting from our Church; and in the Conclusion I have given a true Account of the Proceedings of this Sect from the Time of their first Appearance in the World in foreign Parts, and here amongst us in England from their first Arrival, by which Relation Men may understand what an innocent and holy Sect this is, how conformable to the Evangelick Doctrines and Precepts, or rather how opposite and contrary to the Mind of Christ and his Gospel. I pray God to bless these my Endeavours, to open the Eyes of our deluded Neighbours to see the Truth, that they have forsaken, and to repent of their great Sin; I pray God to confirm the rest of our People in the Profession of this holy Religion against all Errors and
Mi-

The P R E F A C E.

Mistakes without wavering, that they may continue faithful unto Christ until Death, and at last obtain from him the Crown of Life. Amen.

T H E

THE
CONTENTS.

THE Author's Eight Arguments
for Infant Baptism, vindicated,

The First,	Page 6.
The Second,	26.
The Third,	35.
The Fourth,	43.
The Fifth,	46.
The Sixth,	ibid.
The Seventh,	49.
The Eighth,	59.

The Scriptural Mode of Baptism
explain'd, 69.
Mr.

The Contents.

<i>Mr. Stennet's Arguments for Dipping, answer'd,</i>	90.
<i>Infant Baptism in Use in the Primitive Church,</i>	119.
<i>Of the Anabaptists Teachers, 139, &c.</i>	
<i>Mr. Baxter's plain Scripture Proof for Infant Baptism,</i>	163, &c.
<i>—His Arguments to prove it,</i>	170, &c.
<i>Remarks upon Mr. Stennet's Answer to Mr. Ruffen,</i>	184, &c.
<i>Divers Sects of Anabaptists amongst us,</i>	224.
<i>Mr. Hooke's Apology for his Sect examin'd,</i>	234.
<i>Mr. Keach's Rector certified, try'd by the Word of God, &c.</i>	264.
<i>Of the Christian Sabbath,</i>	277.
<i>Of Original Sin,</i>	297.
<i>Of Forms of Prayer and our Liturgy,</i>	312.
<i>Of the Sinfulness of Schism,</i>	325.
<i>Of the Danger of Apostacy,</i>	335.
<i>The History of the Anabaptists,</i>	341.
<i>Their first coming into England,</i>	367.
<i>The Fifth-Monarchy Insurrection,</i>	380.
<i>The</i>	

The Contents.

The Invasion of the Duke of Monmouth, 390.

The present Divisions and State of the Anabaptists, 401.

THE

The Names and Trades of some
of the *Anabaptists* Principal
Teachers, and their Meetings.

- M**R. Joseph Stennet, Cheap-side.
 Mr. John Pigget in Wild-street.
 — Glover, a Glasier of White-Chapel,
 Virginia-street.
 — Midlane, a Weaver, Savory's Dock.
 Southwark.
 Rich. Angel, a Cooper, Angel-Alley,
 White-Chapel.
 — Malden, a Shooemaker, a Leg of
 Mutton Baptist.
 — Congrove, a Taylor, in Goodman's-
 Fields.
 — Osburne, a Glass-maker.
 Sam. Halls, a Baker.
 — Perkins, in Bore's-Head-Yard in
 Catharine-Wheel-Alley.
 — Davies, in White-Chapel.
 — Jacobz, a Lifeguard-Man, in South-
 wark.
 — Foxhall, a Butcher, in Horsey-
 Downes.
 Jos. Jenkins, a Ribbon-Weaver, in
 Harts-street.
 — Mullener, a Taylor, in White's-
 Alley, Morefields.
 — Stevens,

——Stevens, a Journeyman Shoe-maker, *Rosemary-lane.*

Mr. Croseley in *Cripple-Gate.*

William Rawlins, a Taylor, of *St. Neots*, *Huntingtonshire.*

Nath. Alcock, a Farmer of *Bedfordshire.*

Sam. Gurrey, a Farmer in *Bedfordshire.*

Jo. Nutter of *St. Neots*, Sieve-maker.]

——Skingle, a Smith of *Hartfordshire.*

Rich. Robinson, a Thatcher of *Upminster* in *Essex.*

J. Paine, a Shooe-maker of *Veil* in *Essex.*

——Gander, a Tinman about *Shadwell.*

——Burch, a Hatter.

——Sunford, a Tallow-Chandler.

These and such like Persons are the Leaders of this Sect of the *Anabaptists*, and by these we may judge of the rest. There are a great Number of them about *London*, but their Names and Meeting-Houses I cannot yet learn.

A
 VINDICATION
 OF
 Infant-Baptism,
 AGAINST THE
 Dipping Sect.

I Am not sorry that this Controversy, which has remain'd dormant for some Years, is again reviv'd in these unhappy Days. For while we have been asleep, our Adversaries have been watchful, and busie in sowing Tares, in poisoning our people with their Damnable Heresie, and spreading abroad their pernicious Principles. What Progress they have made, is not unknown to such as are acquainted with the present State of Religion in this Nation. The simple and unlearned are insensibly
 A drawn

2 *A Vindication of Infant-Baptism,*

drawn away by their bewitching Insinuations in Cities and Country, have been by them perswaded to renounce their first Faith and Baptism, and to engage themselves in this Sect, to the apparent Hazard of their Salvation.

Tho' this Perswasion hath been long ago, and frequently overcome and baffled by the Pious Endeavours of learned Men, yet now again it dares lift up its Head, and bid defiance to the most visible Truths of the Gospel; and being encouraged by the numerous Increase of its Ignorant Profelytes, it threatens with Subversion both our Church and State. I hope God may so far bless my Endeavours, that I may be an Instrument to prevent further Mischief, and stop the Increase of this Error, so destructive to the Souls of Infants, to the Welfare of Christianity in general, and to the Peace of our Church, Kingdom, and People. This was the Motive that prevail'd upon me to publish my First *Antidote*; for finding a Number of my Neighbours in *Essex* deluded by the *Anabaptists*, and knowing the Wickedness and Danger of this Sect, and how contrary to the Holy Oracles, and the Mind of Christ, I writ my Thoughts of Infant-Baptism, as briefly as the Subject would permit, for the Information of those whom I am obliged to take Care of, and of others, who are not yet carried away with this Delusion of Satan. But as soon as my Book appear'd abroad, the Adverse Party

were

were alarm'd at my representing them Pernicious and Erroneous ; and one who has more Zeal for his Sect than Reason, Ability or Learning to defend it, pretends to answer me ; but how weakly, how rudely, scurrilously and uncivilly, I leave to the Christian Reader to judge. He calls himself *R. Morgan*, and I understand he is a School-master about *Wapping* : A Person well qualify'd to instill ill Principles into Youth, and do mischief in his Station ! I could have wish'd he had been a Man of more Sense, Civility and Sincerity. I cannot but take notice of one of the same Name in the *Jesuits* College of *Rome* ; and another *Morgan*, if not the same person, amongst the Popish Priests in *England* : The first is mention'd in the Letters concerning the *Quietists*, both busie and active enemies of the Church of *England*. 'Tis known these Firebrands of Hell are amongst our Dissenters, chiefly amongst the *Anabaptists*. My Adversary is represented to me as a Seventh-day-dipper, and as the *British* name of *Pelagius* the Heretick was *Morgan*, fancy there is more than One or Two Resemblances between my School-master and that Adversary of the Truth, and Disturber of the Publick Peace of the *African* Church ; so we may perceive in him the same deceitful and obstinate Spirit that admits of no repentance ; a Spirit both blind and deaf to Reason and Divine Revelation, that rejects the clearest Truths, and the most approved

A 2

Doctrines,

4 *A Vindication of Infant-Baptism.*

Doctrines, which contradict its Perswasions and Practices, as we may take notice in the following Reply to Mr. *Morgan's* trifling and imperfect Answer to my Arguments and Reasons for *Infant-Baptism*. I might have been excused from making any Return, or minding such an insignificant Pamphlet, that serves to no other purpose, but to make good again the old Fable of *Midas* with his Asses Ears. But understanding that his Party is very diligent in handing it about the City and Country, as the like Heretical Books and for fear it might do the more Mischief, I were silent, I have been forced to this *Second Antidote*; wherein you have a further Justification of the Doctrines and Practices of our Church, in opposition to the Errors of this *Dipping-Sept*, with other Particulars fit for the Cognizance of our People, to prevent this growing Mischief.

I shall pass over the uncivil, rude and abusive Title of his Libel, which to discredit me the more he caus'd to be put into the publick Prints, and shall prove his charge there against me of perverting the Word of God, to be a Slander, false and malicious. I shall begin with Page Four, where he saith He could be glad to see in my Book a Spirit coming a Gentleman, a Scholar, or a Christian, &c. But R. M. who seems to be not acquainted with such a Spirit, and discovers in his whole Performance a Genius quite contrary to the Dictates of such a Spirit, can

not be a good Judge in this Case. If he had known what becomes a Gentleman, a Scholar, or a Christian, methinks he should have allowed to my Person, Character and Function, one of these Titles, which he grants, and liberally bestows upon his Blue, Green, White, and Leathern-Apron Preachers; but I must be content to swallow this and many other such unmannerly Reflections from him and his Sect, who always cast Dirt upon those, who endeavour to recall them out of their Heresie, and never fail to reward their most charitable Endeavours with Slander and Abuse. I am not conscious to my self of having said or publish'd any thing in relation to them, but what becomes Truth, the Honour of my Calling, and the common Practice of Christianity. Did not the Prophets reprove the *Jews* for their Errors and Vices, and Christ and his Apostles the ancient *Pharisees*, without breaking through the Rules of Good Manners? We are to lay open Sin, Error and Impiety, without any regard to such Nice and Tender Minds, who are like those that were formerly distemper'd with a certain Malady call'd the *Sweating Sickness*; when the kind Physician applied to them his Remedies to cure them, they cried out *Murder, Murder, ye kill me, ye kill me*. I cannot with a good Conscience flatter or encourage them in their Pernicious Errors, but must speak to them in the Language of Mr. *Baxter*: *Sin and Schism have dealt so bitterly with Eng-*

6 *A Vindication of Infant-Baptism,*
land, my Native Country, and especially the
Schism of the Anabaptists, which yet continues
to deal so bitterly with our Church and
Kingdom, that I dare not deal sweetly with it.
However by this first Essay of *R. Morgan's*
Pen, I understand how I am to be treated by
him.

It seems he acknowledges the Children
brought to Christ to be Infants, which some
Anabaptists have denied: But he rejects the
Inferences, that we and all the Reformed
Churches draw from this Relation of Three
Evangelists, Matth. 19. 14. Mark 10. 14.
Luke 18. 16. to warrant the Baptism of
Babes, *Suffer little Children to come unto me*
and forbid them not, for of such is the Kingdom
of God. Now to inform my Adversary, and
rectify his Mistakes in this Case, 'tis neither
from the bringing of those Children, nor their
coming to Christ, nor our Saviour's blessing
of them, that we conclude that they are to
be Baptized; therefore he might have spared
these idle and impertinent Expressions. *Baptism*
and Blessing signify one and the same
thing, or if all those who came to him were bap-
tized, there might be some Argument. How
vainly does *R. M.* endeavour to ridicule our
Reasoning, and the Intention of Christ, by
citing these imperfect Premises? We con-
clude not the Baptism of Infants from thence,
but from the following Command, and ex-
press Order, which our Saviour delivers to
his Apostles, their Successors, and all future

Ages.

Ages, as a standing Law and Rule to observe,
To suffer little Children to come unto him. This
 Invitation had been to no purpose, for the
 benefit of others of that Age, if he had
 design'd it only while he was here upon
 Earth; for this Command was given at the
 latter end of his Ministry, when he was
 departing out of the World, as we may
 understand from the Evangelists, and parti-
 cularly from *St. Mark*, Chap. 10. Ver. 33,
 34. He was then going up to *Jerusalem*, to
 suffer Death for Mankind. To what Intent
 does he invite Children to come unto him,
 or to receive his Blessing, when he was to be
 no longer on Earth? What Advantage could
 they expect from him during his short Abode,
 if it was design'd for no other purpose, but
 to lay his Hands upon them and bless them?
 This Coming therefore spoken of by Christ,
 is a Precept directed to his Apostles and
 Ministers of his Church, to suffer them, and
 not hinder their coming to him, and an
 Invitation that concerns all Infants of Be-
 lieving Parents of the succeeding Ages, to
 come unto him. And if they have no other
 way to come unto him, now he is in Heaven,
 but to come into his Church, his Mystical
 Body, to be Members of it, certainly we may,
 without any violence offer'd to the Sense and
 Meaning of Christ, conclude, That his Will
 is, that they should be initiated, and enter'd
 into it by that Ordinance that he hath ap-
 pointed, which is Baptism. And the rather

8 *A Vindication of Infant-Baptism,*

we are to give this Interpretation to our Redeemer's Words, because we find them spoken elsewhere for the same purpose, and importing the same Sense: *Come unto me all ye that labour and are heavy laden, &c. Matth. 11. 28.* By those that *Labour*, we are to understand the *Jewish* Transgressors, labouring under the *Mosaick* Ordinances; by those that are *heavy Laden*, the *Gentile* Sinners, loaden with Iniquity: Christ invites them to him, to come to be now Partakers of his Grace and Mercy. How shall these, or any other Persons, come to Christ to be benefited by him, if they don't come to his Ordinance of Introduction into his Holy Profession; if they continue at a Distance in their Impiety, Unbelief, Impenitency, and persist in Communion with other Infidels. Therefore the first outward step of their coming, is their Admittance into his Holy Religion, which was always perform'd by Baptism, the appointed Method. In the same signification we find this coming to Christ understood, *John 5. 40. Ye will not come to me, that ye might have Life.* Where Christ upbraids the *Jews*, because of their Obstinacy, and Rejection of him and his Profession; That they would not come to it. So likewise *John 6. 37. All that the Father giveth me shall come to me, and him that cometh to me, I will in no wise cast out.* I suppose that our Adversaries cannot deny, but that this coming relates to Persons of all future Ages, who are thereby encouraged to

come

come to Christ, to the Profession and Practice of his Religion, and to the initiating Ordinance, with a gracious Assurance of Favour and Acceptance. And why may we not understand this Command of Christ, *Suffer little Children to come unto me, &c.* in the same Sense, for their Admission and Entrance into his Holy Religion?

If the Rule St. Peter lays down for our understanding the Holy Scriptures be Orthodox and True, *That no Prophecy of the Scripture is of any private Interpretation*, 2 Pet. 1. 2. we cannot take the Command of Christ but as his Intent, relating to other Children, besides those of that Time and Nation; which if we do, Pray how will you have your Infants come to Christ? Is there any other way prescribed to us but Baptism, or an Entrance into his Covenant or Church, which is his Mystical Body?

How does my Adversary labour to baffle all the Conclusions, that are drawn by all Orthodox Churches from this express and plain Order of Christ, by telling of his wondering *where the Argument lies for Baptism of Children in their being brought to Christ, that he should bless them.* Is he so purblind, as not to see that he stumbles at the Beginning of the Passage, so carefully and diligently related by Three Evangelists, which they would not have done with that Harmony and Agreement, were it of no other Importance, but for the Advantage of the Children of

10 *A Vindication of Infant-Baptism,*
that Age and Time. Is R. M. so weak, as
to think, that he can answer all the Argu-
ments that a Number of Learned Prote-
stants gather from this Relation of the
Evangelists, to justify Infant Baptism, with a
Wonder! Truly, an *Anabaptist* is a Wonder
amongst all the Professors of the Christian
Name, for confessing publicly in their Cate-
chism, and elsewhere, That all new born
Children are out of Covenant with God;
and for refusing to bring them in at this
Invitation of Christ.

If our Adversaries had any esteem for
Foreign Divines, they would not despise
their Judgment, that agrees with us in this
Interpretation of the Words; they all look
upon them as a Positive Order and Warrant
to bring our Children to Christ in Baptism;
The *Harmony of Confessions* understand them
as design'd by our Saviour for that purpose;
And Calvin in his *Inst. of Christ. Relig.*
lib. 4. c. 16. §. 7. says, *If it be just we*
should bring Children to Christ, why not to be
admitted to Baptism, the Sign or Seal of our
Communion and Society with Christ? Trelcatius
in his *Inst. Theol.* lib. 2. upon Baptism, affirms,
As Infants are Partakers of the Covenant, they
are to be Partakers of the Sign and Seal of that
Covenant, which is Baptism. So likewise
Bucanus in *Loc Comm.* 47. Q. 35. speaks the
same Language, *That there is no other means*
to bring Infants to Christ but by Baptism, to
introduce them into the Church, which is Christ's

My

Mystical Body, for they are not yet capable of Instruction. Thus Zanchius, an Eminent Divine, tells us, *We believe also with all the Ancient Church, that we are to receive to the Sacrament of Baptism, not only the Adult, who are able to acknowledge their Repentance for their Sins, and also their Faith in Christ, but their Children also, because they are to be reckoned as belonging to the Covenant, according to the Apostles saying, That the Children of Believers are Holy, 1 Cor. 7. 14. Chiefly because Christ hath not any where alter'd the Command of God to Abraham, to mark with the Sign of the Covenant also the Children of Believing Parents. Nay he hath said, Suffer little Children to come unto me, for of such is the Kingdom of God. In the Theses of Saumur, compos'd by a Number of Famous Divines, and approv'd of in this Article by all the Protestant Ministers of France, de Pædo-Baptismo, we find this Doctrine asserted, For while Children are brought into the Church, they are reckon'd in the Number of the Faithful. And Numb. 34. There were Two purposes in Circumcision in relation to the Adult, one on God's part, and the other on Man's part; but in relation to Children but one till they came of Age. And speaking of David, and of his Child that was departed, they say, That Persuasion of Believers of the old Testament, Christ has approved of and confirm'd by his Authority; For when Infants were brought to him so young, that they were carried in Arms, and were named Bephe, (there*

12 *A Vindication of Infant-Baptism,*

(therefore 'tis evident that they were not capable of Reason) and the Disciples kept them off, for they thought they would be troublesome to Christ: he reproveth their Precipitancy, and commanded to bring Infants to him, he pray'd for them, and declared τὸ ἴσταν, &c. Truly we are to Judge from the Wisdom, the Goodness, and Mercy of Christ, that he prayed for nothing besides their Salvation. That he could not doubtless do, but from this Supposition, that his Prayers would be grateful, and acceptable to God; but they would not have been, if God had altogether excluded those Infants from a Participation of the Covenant of Grace. And why did he think fit to lay his Hands on them? That by this Action he might testify, that they were of the Number in whom the Promises of God, relating to Saving Grace, are approved and confirmed. I could bring many other Foreign Divines, who understand this Text as we do, for a Command of Christ to bring Infants to his Ordinance of Baptism. But my Antagonist regards not their Judgment and Reasoning, no more than of *Turks* and Infidels; but wonders at them, and we no less wonder at him and his Heterodox Party and Sect. Elsewhere he ranks these Religious Ministers of Christ amongst, and values their Piety, Learning and Persuasion no more than of *Turks*, *Papists*, and *Heathens*, as we shall hereafter observe. Therefore to deny that Baptism is intended here by the Command of Christ to his Apostles, is to declare against the Judge

me

ment of the Christian Church of all Ages and Nations, who give that Interpretation to the Words.

Now to render the meaning of Christ more intelligible, I have taken notice of the Greek Words ἐλθεῖν πρὸς μὲ. For 'tis the common Practice of the Spirit of God in the Original Text, to explain by the choice of the Words, his Design and Intent, as I could instance in divers other Places of Holy Scripture; therefore if we take the Preposition πρὸς, *pros*, and add it to the Verb ἐλθεῖν, there will be *profelthein*, from which Verb in another Sense is derived the Word *Profelyte*. I have here observ'd what manner of Coming Christ understands in this Place, namely such a Coming, whereby Children may be Profelyted to him; which cannot be perform'd in the Christian Church but by Baptism. This Remark my uncivil Antagonist in his Title Page, and elsewhere, wrongfully calls perverting the Greek Text, tho' προσέλθειν τῷ Θεῷ, or τῷ Χριστῷ, is of the same signification as ἐλθεῖν πρὸς τὸν Χριστόν. We find these Greek Words to the same purpose, Heb. 7. 25. σώζειν εἰς τὸ παντελὲς δύναται τὰς προσερχομένους δι' αὐτοῦ τῷ Θεῷ. *He is able to save to the uttermost all that come unto God through him.* And can any come unto God but by the means that Christ hath appointed? In the same Sense, without perverting the Text, you have it, Heb. 11. 6. If R. M. had been in his right Senses, he would

14 *A Vindication of Infant-Baptism.*

would not have made such a needless Exception ; or if he had had any regard to Truth or Good Manners, he would not have accused me falsely and so publickly in Print. Since I have met with the same Remark in Doctor Hammond : *Christ, saith he, was so far from excepting against the Age of Children as a prejudice, or a hinderance to their coming, that is, to their Profelytism) that he affirms them to be the Pattern of those, of whom his Kingdom is to be made up.* And Mr. Obed Wills, who has examin'd Henry Danvers's false and wrong Quotations, saith, Page 124. *The Children are brought to him by others, yet they are said to come unto him, Matth. 19. Elthein pros, the Words of which Profelyte is made.*

R. M. adds, Tho' if it were, it would be to little purpose, unless he could prove that *πρὸς Χριστὸν* always signifies to Profelyte; Who knows not that this Greek Verb alone, is not to be understood in that Sense? But when there follows *πρὸς μὲν*, or *πρὸς τὸν Χριστὸν*, or *τῷ Χριστῷ*, to come to me, or to come to Christ, we cannot but take it in that manner, for a *Coming* to partake of his Ordinance appointed by him, for our Introduction into the Number of his Church and People. If there be any other way now for our Infants coming to Christ than this, let them tell us.

But how does my Antagonist fly out against me upon this Observation and Interpretation

retation of the Words, by accusing me of *singenuity, of sinfulness in adding to the Word of God, &c.* But as this Charge is false and ill grounded, I have no reason to regard it, but to pity the Weakness and Prejudices of my Calumniator, that carries him to such extravagant Fancies so opposite to the Mind of Christ, who in the Reason that he gives for Infants Coming, interprets his own Meaning, by saying, *Of such is the Kingdom of God.* That is such a Coming whereby they are to be enter'd into, and made Partakers of the Kingdom of God, or of the Kingdom of the *Messiah.* And before they can be made Subjects of that Kingdom, they are to come to him by some Method or Institution, that he hath appointed in his Church for their Reception, which we must necessarily understand to be Baptism, the Entrance or Gate into this blessed Kingdom.

But says R. M. to repeat this is enough to confute it, while as I think no less can be meant, but that Baptism confers Grace. 'Tis no wonder to find him in a Mistake; 'tis his ordinary Practice to falsify my Meaning, to suppress my Reasoning, to pervert my Sense, to add and diminish from the Text, and then to exclaim against the vain Notions of his weak Brain, as if they were mine. If it were possible, I would instruct this mistaken Adversary in the true Doctrine of our Church, of Christianity, and of Protestant Divines; which I perceive he never under-

16 *A Vindication of Infant-Baptism,*

understood, nor the Disputes between
and the *Roman Church* about the Efficacy
the Sacraments. For that purpose I must
tell him, That we look upon the outward
Performance of Baptism, or the Application
of Water by God's true Ministers lawfully
Call'd and Ordain'd, to be an Institution
commanded by Christ, and appointed for
our first Admission, and of our Children
into the Kingdom of Grace. And none can
pretend to have any personal Right or Claim
to the outward Advantages that belong to it,
who either despise or neglect this Ordinance
of Christ, or are kept from it, whatever
Men may pretend to the contrary. 'Tis
true, none but the Spirit of God can confer
Saving Grace; but 'tis our Duty to introduce
our Infants by Prayer and Baptism into the
Church, where this Holy Spirit works upon
the Minds of Men, and produceth that
Grace, which by the Mercy of God is effectual
to Salvation. *R. M.* not being able to
answer my Reasoning, runs blindfold into
another Controversy. I say here no more
than what our Church has declar'd, That
Baptism is the Entrance into our Holy Pro-
fession. And *Mr. Tombes* in his Dispute a-
gainst *Mr. Baxter*, confesseth, That all ought
to be admitted Church Members by Baptism
saying *I grant that Baptism is the way and
manner of solemn Admission into the Church.*
I mean the regular way. Therefore tho' the
Baptism of Water confers no Saving Grace

is often confer'd unto us in Baptism from the Mercy of God. No outward Agents or Agency can work of themselves upon the inward Spirit a Divine Change, we must expect that Operation from the sanctifying spirit of God ; but as we are commanded, we are to use the outward Means, and introduce the Party into the Church, the Kingdom of Christ, that he may receive there the Blessings of the Holy Spirit. God's Orders are to be complied with, if we will obtain the Benefits expected ; *Naaman's* Leprosy had never been cured by a Miracle, if he had not obey'd the Prophets Appointment, and wash'd himself Seven times in the River *Jordan* ; The blind Man in the Gospel, that was commanded to go and wash in the Pool of *Siloam*, had never recover'd his Sight, if he had not submitted to this Method, prescribed to him by our Saviour. Now to please my Adversary I will give him another Simile ; *St. John* tells us of the Pool of *Bethesda*, Chap. 5. That *whosoever first, after the troubling of the Water, stepped in, was made whole of whatsoever Disease he had.* We can't believe that the troubled Water could have that Vertue to cure all manner of Diseases ; 'twas the Angel of God, that was the Physician, or the Blessing and Power of God by him ; but if they had not stept in, they had never been heal'd in that ordinary Course. I leave it to my Adversary's Wisdom to make the Application in relation to the Baptism

18 *A Vindication of Infant-Baptism.*

Baptism of Infants, which is their *Pool of Bethesda*; and does not our Church Catechism tell us, That the *Sacraments* are visible *Signs of inward and spiritual Grace* ordained by *Christ*, as a *Means* whereby we receive the same, and a *Pledge* to assure us thereof? And again, That being by *Nature* Children of *Wrath*, we are by *Baptism* made the Children of *Grace*. Likewise the *Anabaptist's Catechism* saith, That *Baptism* becomes effectual means of *Salvation*, only by the *Blessing of Christ*, &c. What do I say more? Let any Person of any ordinary Capacity judge between me and my wise School-Master, and he shall find his abusive Reflections, and Truth on my side. If it be the Kingdom of *Grace*, we all know that *Baptism* is a visible Entrance into it; this he leaves out, and the following Reasons which he cannot deny; and this Expression, *Of such is the Kingdom of God*, discovered their fitness in that tender and innocent Age to be admitted. Unless they be brought to and made Partakers of *Baptism*, they cannot have any Right or Real Interest in that spiritual Kingdom; or to its Advantages unto which *Christ* invites them: For, as under the *Law*, they who were not Circumcised were to be cut off and excluded from God's People and Church, so under the *Gospel*, unbaptized Persons cannot be reckon'd among *Christ's Disciples*; or Members of his Church or Kingdom, &c. To all this *R. M.* gives no answer. What is there here so contrary

our Churches Doctrine, to the Harmony of Confessions, or anywise agreeing with the errors of the *Church of Rome*? Does not our Rubrick in the beginning of the Administration, speak after our Saviour's Words, *That none can enter into the Kingdom of God, except he be Regenerate and Born a New of Water, &c.* Does not the Minister in Christ's Name receive the Child into the Congregation of Christ's Flock by Baptism? Does not the Minister immediately after Baptism declare, *Seeing that this Child is Regenerate and grafted into the Body of Christ's Church, &c.* And do not we then thank God? *That he hath been pleased to Regenerate the Child with his Holy Spirit, to receive him for his own Child by Adoption, and to incorporate him into his Holy Church.* Here is more in this Thanksgiving supposed to be effected at Baptism, than I affirm, and yet agreeable with the Current of Scripture, namely a Spiritual Regeneration, as well as a visible introduction into the Number of Christ's Disciples. And conformable to this Doctrine is the Answer in the Catechism: *In my Baptism, wherein I was made a Member of Christ, the Child of God, and an Inheritor of the Kingdom of Heaven.* But my learned Antagonist understands not his own Catechism, no more than ours, nor his Confession of Faith, where we may read, *Baptism is an Ordinance of the New Testament, ordained by Jesus Christ to be unto the Party Baptized a sign of his fellowship with*

20 *A Vindication of Infant-Baptism.*

with him in his Death and Resurrection, of being ingrafted into him, of Remission of Sin &c. As 'tis a visible sign, when Persons are partakers of it according to Christ's Institution, we have reason to believe, from his Promise annexed to it, that they obtain invisible Grace, not from the Water, nor the Sanctity of the Administrator, but from the Mercy, Goodness and Efficacy of Christ and his Holy Spirit, which are not wanting to our Obedience and Compliance with his Orders, in things never so mean in appearance. But my Adversary harbors a vain Supposition, That I joyn with the Church of Rome that affirms, *That Baptism confers Grace.* If the poor Man had not been distempered in his Brain, or if he had understood *English*, he would not have had such a Fancy of me; He would have known how to have put a difference between a Privilege of Admittance into Christ's Church, and Spiritual Grace confer'd in Baptism.

He tells us next; This Invitation of Christ is a *Declarative of the Goodness of God to Infants*, which Grace, no Infant ordained of God to so great a Blessing shall ever lose by any real or supposed neglect of Men. He tells us great News; That the Words and Command of Christ is a Declaration of the Goodness of God to Infants. Who doubts of it? The Question is, what Goodness is here intended, Is there any other Goodness than the word

import

port, That Infants should come to Christ to be made Subjects of his Spiritual Kingdom? And does not he appoint to them in his Order the means to obtain so considerable a Grace, namely by coming to him, that they may be received by him into it as Members of it? Was ever this Goodness of God declared to any other Infants, but to such as were brought, or came to Christ? Or does he find in Holy Scripture any Infants ordained to so great a Blessing, but those who were brought to him? Could such as remain'd in the polluted State of Nature, in Original Sin, out of his Communion, pretend to any such Blessing from him? To depend upon the Predestination and Ordination to an End without the prescribed Means, is a *Fanatick* Madness, and *Antinomian* Principle. This is the persuasion of *R. Mor-*
an, and of the *Anabaptists* in their Confession of Faith: Where they teach, That *Elect Infants dying in Infancy, are regenerated and saved by Christ through the Spirit, &c.* They have no Assurance in the Word of God of their Election, Regeneration, or Salvation, without a Compliance with the outward Means, which if we neglect, causeth us to fall short of the promised Advantage. Therefore this supposition, with which our Adversaries flatter themselves is vain, idle, and unwarrantable, having no foundation in Holy Scripture, but proceeds from their wild and groundless Fancy. Nay, 'tis contrary

22 *A Vindication of Infant-Baptism,*

trary to the whole Current of the Word of God, and the manner of his Dispensing his Spiritual Blessings by Rules prescribed to the Obedience of the Faithful. Thus the Carnal Defilements were removed by the Washing and Sprinklings of the *Mosaick Law*. The bitings of the fiery Serpents were healed by the looking up of the wounded upon the brazen Serpent. *Naaman's* Leprosy was cleansed by his washing Seven times in the Waters of *Jordan*. Likewise under the Gospel, the Man born Blind had his Eyesight granted at the application of the Water of the Pool of *Siloam*. And does not our Blessed Saviour, in the case of Infants, as well as of the Adult, *Sanctify and cleanse them as the rest of his Church, by the washing of Water and the Word?* Ephes. 5. 26. So the Apostle tells us, *Titus* 3. 5. That Children, and all his People, are *saved by the washing of Regeneration, and the renewing of the Holy Ghost*. Has God appointed any particular Method for their Salvation? Our Adversaries must have a strange Confidence to advance such Doctrines, and impose them upon the Christian World.

R. M. adds, *If Baptism were intended here, it would have been spoken of as well as his Blessing and his laying Hands on them.* That it was intended by Christ in this Order, left to his Apostles and their Successors in the Church of God, is plain to be understood, and intelligible to all Orthodox Christians enlightened

lightned and directed by the Spirit of God,
 and obscure to none, but the blind and ob-
 stinate *Anabaptists*, who wrest the Scriptures
 to their own destruction, 2 *Pet.* 3. 16. For
 we have no other way now to bring our In-
 fants to Christ, but this, to enter them into
 the Church and Kingdom, the initiating Or-
 nance for them as well as the Adult.
 Therefore how dares my bold Answerer
 fleet upon this Interpretation of the Words
 of Christ, confirm'd by all the Fathers, and
 the Christian Churches of all Nations and
 Ages, that have look'd upon them and quo-
 ted them as their warrant to Baptize Infants,
 saying, 'Tis Nonsense to infer Infant Baptism
 from such a Text? Is *R. Morgan* only gifted
 with Sense and Reason? We find no signs of
 these Endowments in his Pamphlet; neither
 can he tell us where the Nonsense lies.
 Was the Author of the Constitutions pub-
 lish'd under the name of *Clemens Romanus*,
 guilty of this Nonsense? For there we find
 these words, *l. 6. c. 19. Βαπτίζετε δὲ ὑμῶν τὰ*
παιδιά, &c. Baptize your Infants, and Edu-
 cate them in the Discipline and Admonition
 of God; for saith our Lord, *Suffer little*
children to come unto me and forbid them not,
&c. And *Tertullian* in his Chapter of *Bap-*
tism runs into the same nonsense, by quoting the
 same Words of Christ by way of Objection
 for Infant Baptism, shewing that it was thus
 understood by the Christian Church. To
 these I could bring all the Orthodox Com-
 mentators

24 *A Vindication of Infant-Baptism,*
mentators upon the Word of God, who infer
from hence the Baptism of Infants: There-
fore to charge them all, and the Primitive
Fathers with *nonsense*, is an Impudent Ex-
pression, that never dropt from the Pen
of an *Anabaptist*.

R. M. saith next, That the words were spoken
for another purpose long before Christ's Death.
In good sense, my Antagonist is resolved to
entertain us with false Notions two at a time.
For in *Mark* 10. 33, 34. the same day that
this Command was deliver'd to the Apostles
in a House, he went forth into the way, and
was travelling towards *Jerusalem*, Christ told
his Apostles, *Behold, we go up to Jerusalem*
and the Son of Man shall be deliver'd unto the
chief Priests, and unto the Scribes, and they shall
condemn him to Death, &c. And by the
other Evangelists, it appears that this Order
was deliver'd to the Apostles at the latter
end of his Ministry, some few days before his
Crucifixion. And that it was spoken to another
purpose than the words signify, is plain in
sense in *R. Morgan*. Would he make our
Saviour guilty of *Equivocations* or *Mentis*
Reservations? Or has *R. Morgan* so little sense
left in his Noddle, as to fantasie that Christ
invites Infants to him to any other purpose
than that they should come to him, to partake
of the Blessings of his Kingdom, unto which
he declares they have a Right to pre-
tend? Or does he think to persuade us any
thing so contrary to Reason, and the express
Mind of Christ?

How well does my wise Antagonist answer my Appeal, let the Christian Reader judge, whether this Text is not much more intelligible for Infant-Baptism, than God's saying, *I am the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob*, was to prove the Resurrection of the Body from the Dead, and the real subsistence of Souls. Without any reason given, and without discovering the disparity of the Arguments, he boldly answers with a Non-sensical No; and adds, *Should such a Divine Logician draw the Consequence from the Text in Controversy for Infant-Baptism, we would heartily submit.* I must tell him, what the Universal Church of Christ, which is directed by his Holy Spirit according to his Promise, concludes and infers from Scripture, is a Truth and Consequence drawn by this Divine Logician. Now the present and Primitive Universal Church of Christ draws this Conclusion and Consequence from this Text, as we do for Infant-Baptism; therefore this Consequence and Conclusion is a Truth drawn from this Text by this Divine Logician, and his Holy and Infallible Spirit. 'Tis very strange that our Anabaptists are so wilfully obstinate, as to shut their Eyes to so plain a Text and Order of Christ for Infant Baptism; for if the Words were spoken at the time of his Departure out of the World, they were intended for the Benefit of some Children of the succeeding Ages; now as the E-

B

vangelists

26 *A Vindication of Infant-Baptism,*

vangelists declare, they were spoken at the Time of his Departure, a few Days before his Crucifixion; therefore they were intended for the Benefit of some Children of the future and succeeding Ages. Again, if those Children of the succeeding Ages, who by this Command are order'd to come unto Christ, have no other way prescribed to them but Baptism, and are capable of no other Coming, they are without question to be Baptized; but 'tis certain that they have no other way, nor are they capable of any other Coming: Therefore by the Order by the Invitation, and Command of Christ they are to be admitted to Baptism, and to come to him, and into his Church and Kingdom, by that initiating Ordinance.

2. Upon my second Argument drawn from the Words, *Matth. 28. 14. Go and teach all Nations, baptizing them, &c.* 'Tis remarkable that both we and our Adversaries make use of this Text to justify our several Doctrines and Practices; we by observing the Word hath a double signification, and they by adhering to one. Now this is the general Commission of Christ by which he alter'd the Seal of the former Covenant, and instead of Circumcision, appointed Baptism to be a standing Ordinance in his Church, to introduce Profelytes into his Holy Profession. Tho' our Adversaries draw from hence a perverse and erroneous Conclusion against the Right of our Infant

to Baptism, all the Circumstances of this Commission plead for it. *First*, Christ changes only the Seal of the Covenant, and without excepting any for their Nonage, commands to Profelyte his Disciples into his Religion by Baptism. 'Tis reasonably to be presum'd, that he understood those who were formerly capable to be admitted, were not now to be excluded; and having discover'd but a few Days before his Gracious Intention to Infants, there was no need to mention them again in this Order. *Secondly*, The Seal that was appointed to succeed to the former, being taken from the Practice of the *Jewish Church*, that received the Profelytes into its Bosom by Circumcision and Baptism of Infants, as well as of the Adult, 'twas to be supposed without a Prohibition, the same Persons who had formerly a Claim to Baptism, were not now to lose it; for Infant-Baptism, as well as Infant-Circumcision, had been the immemorial Practice of the *Jewish Church*; and our Lord approved of it so well, that he stamp'd upon it his Authority, and commanded the Continuance of it instead of Circumcision. *Thirdly*, The Mildness and Excellency of the Covenant whereof it was to be a Seal, much more favourable than the *Mosaick*, were not likely to deprive Infants of a more easy and less painful Signature than the former, which they enjoy'd by the Divine appointment. *Fourthly*, The Persons unto whom this Commission is directed, *Jews* ac-

28 *A Vindication of Infant-Baptism,*

quainted with all the Privileges of the Jewish Children, God's former Ordinance, and the Practice of the Jewish Church to admit Proselytes by Baptism and Circumcision, they must needs have the same Apprehensions as to the Subjects of Initiation under the Gospel as they had under the Law. Without any Order to the contrary, when Christ ordered them to *Go and Disciple all Nations by Baptism* they must have understood their Commission of Baptizing to have extended to Infants, as well as to actual Professors; common Sense must have dictated to them in this Case, to follow the Customs of their own Church, if there had been no Precept to the contrary. And, as a late Author very well observes, what Reason can any Man give, why he who fetch'd so many of his Institutions from Jewish Usages, should exclude Infants from Baptism, and recede in this Point from the Jewish Church? They are every way as capable of the visible Signs of God's invisible Favour, and of the Benefits of the Covenant under the *New Testament*, as they were under the *Old*; they are as fit Subjects of Baptism now, as they were of Circumcision and Baptism then; their Initiation into both Churches seems to be equally Rational, because, tho' the Sign of the Covenant be alter'd, yet the Covenant still remains the same in respect to God. And there is no reason, why our wise Saviour should lay aside the Practice of Infant-Baptism; but on the

contrary

contrary, there is the same Necessity for its continuance, in respect of Infants that are polluted with Original Sin, and to distinguish the Children of Believers from those of Pagans, and for all other purposes that inclin'd our wise God to appoint to them at first Circumcision as his Seal. *Fifthly*, The Words used by Christ in this Commission include Infants, as well as Persons of riper Years: *All Nations*, without any exception, comprehend Infants, and the Word *μαθητεύσατε*, that signifies both to *Teach* and to *Disciple*, relates to the Adult, who are to be taught and to Babes, who tho' they are not yet of an Age to be instructed, may be enter'd and enrol'd as Disciples into Christ's School. By this Word of Two significations both in *Greek* and *Hebrew*, or in *Syriack*, or in the *Galilean* Language, in which Christ deliver'd this Commission to his Apostles, we may understand, that his Intention was, that Infants should be received into his Church by Baptism, and discipled as well as their Parents. What says *R. Morgan* to this? He tells us, 'Tis a pretty way of arguing, to pervert a Text, and then to draw from it such Consequences as they please. What an abusive Reflection is this upon all Expositors of the Word of God, and Interpreters of the *Greek* Tongue, as if they perverted the Text, by rendering it *Disciple all Nations*. It is so *English'd* by all that are acquainted with that Original Language, and so the

30 *A Vindication of Infant-Baptism,*
Greek Lexicons understand the Word. What
 a Spirit of contradiction must possess my
 Adversary's Mind, to oppose the Judgment
 of all Men of Learning? I will mention only
 Three at present: Mr. Gerard, *Μαθητεύειν*
 saith he, is properly to make Disciples by
 preaching the Word to the Adult, and by
 administering Baptism to Infants; And our
 Learned *Whitaker* tells us *μαθητεύειν* *ἀρχὴ*
 first belongs to Men of riper Years, and by
 vertue of the Covenant also to their Children
 so likewise *Spanheim*, *Dub. 27.* saith, *μαθητεύειν*
est Discipulum facere, non tantum docere
quod suo modo Infantibus aptari potest, quan-
do etiam Parentes pro se & Familia Christi
nomen dant. Matheteuein isto make Discipule
not only to teach, but in some manner may be
proper for Infants, when the Parents for them-
selves and Family engage themselves in Christi
Profession. Here are Three Persons of excel-
 lent Learning, that mention this Word in
 that Sense that I give it, and understand
μαθητεύειν to make Disciples, as well as to Teach
 But I cannot think my School-master, to be
 so ignorant as he seems to be, by saying,
would do well to produce some good Author, who
uses μαθήσκω Manthano, from whence μαθη-
τεύειν, in any other Sense, than to teach or
instruct. I perceive R. M. never consulted
 his *Scaphia* when he writ those Words
 for if a Boy in a Grammar-School did write
 such, and so many Blunders and Falsties, he
 would be in danger of a Whipping, to mind
 him.

him, that μαρδάνω signifies properly *Disco*, *I learn*. and that μαθητεύσατε is immediately derived of μαθητεύω, which Word is *English'd* by all Men of the least understanding in Greek, *I Teach*, or *make Disciples*. To pleasure my Learned Antagonist, I will send him to Two good Authors very well skill'd in their Mother Tongue, to *Plato*, who says, μαρδάνω παρὰ τῶν ἄλλων, *I learn from others*; and to *Xenophon*, where he may find, if he can read Greek, μαρδάνω ἰππεύειν, *I learn to ride*. Now μαθητεύω from whence μαθητεύσατε is derived as its proper Verb, signifies both *I teach* or *I disciple*, or *make Disciples*. So *Schmidius*, a Doctor of the Greek Tongue, interprets it on *Matth.* 27. 57. and so all the other Masters of that Language render it. But can any Man of Reason, or any sense of Religion, allow *R. Morgan* to call this Interpretation of all Greek Authors, and *Scapula's*, a *Cant*, and bestow that scurrilous Title on the Sacred and General Commission deliver'd by Christ to his Apostles, of *Discipling all Nations*? He and his Leathern Apron Treachers are so us'd to Whine and Cant for want of Sense, that 'tis no wonder he makes use of that Word in this Place. I need not tell him what I mean by *Discipling*, Christ explains it, saying, *Baptizing them*, &c. But our Adversaries will suffer none to be call'd Disciples till they have been taught, contrary to the Usage and Practice of our Country: For when a young Pupil is enter'd

32 *A Vindication of Infant-Baptism,*

into a School or University, from that time that his Name is enter'd into the Book, or he is received by the Master, he is reckon'd a Scholar, or Disciple, initiated to be instructed. For *Irenaus*, quoted by *R. M. l. 2. c. 39.* is not pertinent to our purpose. He disputes there against those who affirm'd, That Christ ended his Ministry after his Baptism in one Year; and proves, That he Preach'd, and continu'd during Three Celebrations of the Paschal Lamb teaching the People. *For how could he have Disciples, if he did not teach them? He adds, How could he teach, if he were not of the Age of a Teacher? What is this to the discipling of Infants? for Irenaus speaks of Christ's Adult Disciples, that they were taught and instructed by him. If they had not been prevail'd upon by his Preaching to embrace his Doctrine, they could not be reckon'd his Disciples no more than the Scribes, Pharisees, Pilate, and the Romans, who heard his Teaching. Mr. Stennet labours to prove, That none can be made Disciples without a previous Instruction. We are for teaching Christ's Disciples, as well as our Adversaries; but we affirm, That Infants may be enter'd into Christ's School by the Ordinance of Baptism, and from that time nominated Disciples, when their future Instruction in the Principles of his Holy Religion is secured; and we are for admitting them betimes to the Honour and Privileges of Christ's Disciples. The Reasons he alledges*

alleges to exclude them as the Text of *Luke* 14. 26, 27. and others are only proper to Adult Persons, and have no relation to Infants. His Argument is very weak and improper to conclude from Christ's saying, That he that doth not prefer him before all other Carnal Interests, cannot be his Disciple: That therefore Infants, who have no discerning Faculty to make choice of him, cannot be Christ's Disciples; 'tis as if he should conclude from *St. Paul's* saying, *2 Theff.*

3. 10. *That if any would not work, neither should he eat;* That therefore because Infants cannot work, neither ought they to eat. All such Reasonings of Duties and Practices appointed in the Word of God to Persons of Discretion, conclude nothing in relation to Infants, to deprive them of their Privileges, because they cannot perform them; God never required the same Conditions from them during their Infancy, as from the Adult.

For the primitive manner that he insists upon, which was to begin by Teaching and Preaching the Gospel, concerns not the State of Infants; we invert not the Order and Method which Christ hath established, as he accuses us. If we were to Disciple the *Turks* or *Indians*, we should begin by Preaching the Gospel, as the Apostles did, by perswading them first to Faith and Repentance; and when they are convinc'd to make Profession of it, to baptize them. But 'tis unreasonable in our Adversaries, to require, or expect Infants of Believers should be treated in

34 *A Vindication of Infant-Baptism,*

that Order and Method : They are to be made Disciples young, and have as great a Right to be Profelyted to Christ in Baptism, as Children had to be profelyted to God by Circumcision under and before the Law.

Now if our Adversaries would consult and believe *St. Luke, Acts 15. 16.* they shall find there the Infants of believing and converted Gentiles, expressly named *Disciples*, without any previous Instruction : *Why tempt ye God, saith Peter, to put a Yoke upon the Neck of the Disciples, which neither our Fathers, nor we were able to bear.* What was that Yoke ? 'Tis mention'd *ver. 5.* That it was needful to circumcise them ; now we all know that Circumcision was confer'd on Infants at Eight Days old. This Yoke or Obligation to keep the Law was put upon them, who are there named *Disciples* ; and if those Infants, whom the Superstitious and Christian *Pharisees* would have Circumcised together with their Parents, could not be reckon'd *Disciples* without first being Baptized, 'tis more than propable that they had been admitted to that Ordinance. And does not Christ declare, that whosoever receiveth such little Children, receiveth him. That their Angels behold the Face of his Father which is in Heaven ; that 'tis not his Will that one of those little ones should perish, *Matth. 18.* Is all this proper to be said of any but of Christ's Disciples, Members of his Church and Kingdom ? Is this applicable to those, who continue in the polluted State of Nature, are out

Covenant

Covenant with God, and in the Condition of Children of Heathens? 'Tis not probable that God and Christ should have that regard for the Infants of Infidels, whom he elsewhere names Dogs. Now if our Adversaries argue that none can be *Disciples*, till they have been taught; we may, with the same falacious Reasoning, conclude from *Mark 16. 16. Who-soever believeth not, shall be damn'd.* That all Infants are certainly damn'd, because they cannot actually believe. But as this Inference is false, tho' agreeable with the Letter of Holy Scripture, but not with the Intent and Meaning, so are all the Conclusions taken from those Texts, where the Faith, the Repentance, and the Profession is requir'd as Conditions from the Adult, in order to dispose them for Baptism, when applied to Children by our Adversaries; for in the former Text, the same want of Faith that excludes them from Baptism, excludes them also from Salvation. Therefore such Expressions where the Order of Profelytyng Persons of Ripe years, and their Qualifications are set down, concern not Infants; neither can any thing be reasonably concluded from thence to their Prejudice.

The Third Argument he answers with Contempt, as if that were a sufficient Rebutation of all the Reasons for Infant Baptism, commonly drawn from Infant-Circumcision. This he calls with scorn, *A thread-bare Argument of Baptisms coming in the Room, and instead*

36 *A Vindication of Infant-Baptism,*
stead of Infant Circumcision. R. M. cannot
deny but it does for the same purpose, to
enter, sign, and seal us as God's Covenanted
People under the Gospel, as the Family of
Abraham were by Circumcision under the
Law. But he asks, *Whether it follows that*
it must have the same Subjects? Why not?
Can any *Anabaptist* give any Reason why
Infants should not be brought into Covenant
with God under the Gospel, as well as under
and before the Law? Why should they be
excluded from that Privilege granted to the
Jewish Children? Is there any incapacity in
our Infants more than in the former? Or is
there in the Institution of Baptism any thing
that renders them now unfit Subjects of it?
Are they not as capable to answer all the
Ends of Baptism, as they were of Circum-
cision? That was a Sign of God's Gracious
Favour, and of their Right to his Protection
and Mercy; so is this: That was a Seal of
the Remission of Original Sin; so is this:
That was a solemn Reception into the Con-
gregation of the Faithful; so is this. Their
Infancy doth not hinder, but that they may
be made Members of the Church of God, as
of a Family, Tribe, or other Society; nor
doth it render them incapable of being the
adopted Children of God, any more than
the Children of any other Person; nor of
being Heirs of Eternal Life by virtue of that
Adoption, than by virtue of any other Civil
Adoption, the Heirs to a Temporal Estate.

Infants are capable of all acts of Favour and Honour from God and Men, and of being installed in all the Privileges of Societies, tho' they cannot perform the Duties. And do they not stand in as much need of the Benefits of the Covenant of Grace as Men? In the *Anabaptists* Catechism and Confession of Faith, they acknowledge it, namely, *Original Corruption and Guilt through the Fall of Adam*; but deny Infants any Remedy, which they allow to the Adult, namely, Baptism for the Remission of Sins; tho' Circumcision was formerly for the same purpose. And as Mr. Calvin observes, *l. 4. c. 16. Inst.* when the *Anabaptists*, whom he there compares to *Wild Beasts*, and themselves entangled with the reasonable and unanswerable Arguments drawn from the Practice of Infant-Circumcision, they break through all Consequences, and discredit the Conclusions with abusive Expressions, as my Answerer doth. But does he think by calling this Argument *thread-bare*, that he is able to satisfy our Judgments, and reduce us to a *Non-plus*? Can he baffle and answer all the Reasons of Judicious Divines for the Continuance of Infant-Baptism taken from Infant-Circumcision, with one scurrilous Breath of his Mouth, or one Dash of his injurious and scandalous Pen? None yet could ever give any satisfactory Reason, why Infants should not be now enter'd into Covenant with God by Baptism, as they were by this Order formerly enter'd by Circumcision,

as

38 *A Vindication of Infant-Baptism,*

as a Learned Divine observes ; for if Baptism is ordain'd in lieu of Circumcision, 'tis a Seal of the Gospel Covenant, to be applied to those that belong to it. And if the Promises that appertain to this Covenant relate to our Children, and belong to them as the Holy Scriptures declare, they are, without question to be confirm'd and enter'd into it by the Seal of Baptism, this Sign of the Grace of God, and of the Benefits of our Redemption. To all my Reasoning upon this *Topick*, which I shall not here repeat, *R. M.* is mute, but with his common Civility saith, *There are a great heap of Words to a small degree of Sense* and adds, *The new Covenant is said to come in the room and instead of the old, unto which belongs Circumcision, and yet we must not argue, that therefore the new is a Covenant of Works, because it follows that which was so.* I must confess *R. Morgan* has an incredible degree equally of Sense and Civility, and a sublimity of Reason above the Capacities of all other Men, to argue as he does. 'Tis as if he should say, because the New Covenant is not a Covenant of Works, it needs no Seal to be appropriated to it, nor is any thing required on Man's Part to be perform'd, but we are to be like so many Pieces of Timber and Stones brought into a Building meerly passive ; That there is no need of being enter'd into it by any religious Ceremony appointed by God, and that the former Persons who belong'd to the first Covenant are excluded from the Second.

Here

ere R. Morgan smells very rank of *Antino-*
an Principles, contrary to the drift of the
 Gospel of Christ; For is it reasonable to
 think, that because God has been graciously
 pleased to make with his People a New
 Covenant in Christ, establish'd upon better
 Promises, that there is no kind of Agree-
 ment and Conformity between the one and the
 other? But let my wise Antagonist give me
 leave to inform him, that tho' the New Co-
 venant is not a Covenant of Works, which
 is a very ambiguous Expression, and may be
 taken both in a good and an evil Sense; 'tis a
 Covenant that requires our Obedience to the
 declared Will of God, and never intends to
 bring us to Heaven, without our concurrence,
 without our Faith and Compliance with his
 just and holy Laws, that are promis'd to be
 written by God in our Hearts; that this
 Obedience required under the New, makes it
 so far agreeable with the Old.

Now saith he, *So to argue, is of the same*
force as to argue from Circumcision to Baptism. I
 reply, That Infants, by God's Command,
 were to be Circumcised at Eight Days old,
 and by that Sign and Seal dedicated to God,
 and enter'd into his Covenant; and that
 God having declar'd his good Will and
 Pleasure in relation to those innocent Babes
 in the *Old Testament*, and having never re-
 peal'd this Order of entering them into his
 Covenant; but on the contrary, having with
 anger forbidden the Ministers of his Church

40 *A Vindication of Infant-Baptism,*
to exclude them, and graciously invite
them to come to him in that Ordinance
that succeeds to Circumcision, we may judge
it an Impiety and Rebellion against God,
as well as an injustice to the new born Creatures
to deprive them of God's Favour, and of
their admittance into Christ's mystical Body
which is his Church, as Members of it.
Truly, did our Adversaries weigh their Reasoning
upon this Point, they would find it very
light; for they grant, that Infants were
to be enter'd and engaged in the Covenant
of Works, but not into the Covenant of
Grace; as if they in their tender Age were
capable of that, but not of this, a new and
more favourable Covenant, that promises
without Works to be merciful to their un-
righteousness, *Heb. 8. 12, &c.* He proceeds
next to argue from the Lord's Supper suc-
ceeding to the Paschal Lamb, and says, *The*
Infants did partake of the Lamb; Why then
do they not bring them to the Lord's Table
as some of the Fathers did? I answer, *First,*
find not any Text in the old Law enjoining
Infants to eat of the Paschal Lamb, as they
are commanded to be Circumcised. And
doubtless some Infants were not able nor
fit to be Partakers of it; none but such were
admitted, as could ask the reasonableness of
it, and be instructed in the Design of the
Institution, *Exod. 12. 26, 27.* And there-
fore to tell us, that *it is well known that Infants*
did partake of the Lamb, is false, and not to
be proved by any Scripture.

Secondly, Baptism is a Seal of our New Birth, a Sacrament of Initiation to introduce Children into Christ's Church, without which their Salvation is doubtful: But the Lord's Supper is a Sacrament or Seal of our actual Faith and Obedience, and an open confirmation of our interest in God and Christ, and in the Merits of his Death and Passion. Is there any reason because a Novice, or a young Stripling, may or ought to be admitted to the lowest degree in Christ's School, therefore he must be advanc'd to the highest? Or because a Child's Stomach can digest Milk, therefore we must administer strong Physick, or gross Meats, proper only for Persons of riper Years?

Thirdly, The Sacrament of the Lords Supper was instituted for a Commemoration of the Death of Christ, 1 Cor. 11. 26. For that purpose this Wise Saviour ordain'd it, *Do this in remembrance of me*, Luke 22. 19. Now Infants are not capable of instruction, nor can they answer the end, nor receive the benefits of that Sacrament, as they can of Baptism; where God treats them according to their Capacities, and by an admittance into his Covenant, grants them the remission of original Sin, out of his free Grace, without any regard to their Merits, as he promiseth *Jeremiah* 31. 33. and *Heb.* 8. 11, 12.

Fourthly, In the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper, there is a self-examination required by *St. Paul*; now as Infants are not capable of

42 *A Vindication of Infant-Baptism,*

of that Act of Religion, they cannot be admitted by that Rule of the Apostle; but in Baptism they may, where an outward Profession and Engagement declared in their Names by their Sureties, is sufficient for their Induction into Christ's Church; therefore *R. M.* is under a double mistake, when he saith, *That whatsoever can be said for Infant-Baptism from Circumcision, the same may be said for Infants Communion.* All this is false, and

Grounded upon a false supposition; that Jewish Infants did all eat of the Paschal Lamb.

Fifthly, Neither is there any such necessity for their partaking in the Communion as for their Baptism; for by this Administration they are declared to belong to Christ, to be Members of his visible Church, to be taken out of the corrupt State of Nature, and advanced by Baptism into a State of Grace; they are put into a fair way of Salvation, they may claim afterwards the Title, the Rights and Privileges of Christians, being dedicated to God and Christ in this Ordinance instituted by their Redeemer for that purpose; but unless they be admitted, we have no assurance of their Salvation, nor do they appear to the Redemption of Christ. Most of the Fathers judg'd Baptism so necessary, that they have Condemn'd all unbaptized Children to eternal Damnation, which we do not do; but we ought to leave them to the finite mercy of God, who has not declared himself, or his will in relation to them.

meet with no such necessity in their Communion, till they come to years of discretion, being already within the Pale of the Church, and the Tuition of Christ and his Holy Spirit, to whose Service they are at Baptism dedicated. Let therefore our Adversaries cease upbraid us with this old, musty, nonsensical, and antiquated Objection, borrow'd from that Blasphemous Heretick *Servetus*, burnt at Geneva for his Blasphemies against the Holy Trinity. See Mr. Calvin's *Institutions*.

4. To my Fourth Argument drawn from Cor. 7. 14. the Holiness of Believers Children, How absurd and dogmatical does my Schoolmaster appear ! *What Holiness soever is meant in this Text, I think, saith he, Baptism of Infants can't be inferr'd from thence* : That is, as he should tell us, I know not what Holiness Paul understands : But let Infants born of believers be never so Holy in the Apostle's Judgment, let 'em be never so well disposed and fit for a Dedication to God from the Womb, I don't think that they are to be Baptized, or that St. Paul intends it. Does R. M. fanse his rare thoughts sufficient to satisfy all Doubts, and set aside all Reasons and Arguments drawn from this Text, to prove Infant Baptism ? His thinking faculty is so weak, and while 'tis so beset with his erroneous Opinion, we have no reason to value it, because we have a cloud of Primitive Fathers and Orthodox Expositors, who think otherwise. But why does he think so ? *Because, saith he, if a Husband or a Wife be a believer,*

44 *A Vindication of Infant-Baptism,*

liever, then it gives a right not only to the Infant, but also to the unbelieving Husband or Wife, and all their Adult Children. Here R. M's. Rational Faculty, is as infirm as his Cogitative ; for the case is not alike here. All Adult Husbands, Wives and Children ought to profess their own Belief before Baptism, before they can be Consecrated to God, but from Infants born of Believing Parents no such thing is either required or possible till they come of Age. They are indulged in their Weakness and Incapacity by the mercy of God, and their Sureties answering for them is accepted, because they can't answer for themselves ; but 'tis not probable that the Faith or Holiness of a Husband, or of a Wife should intitle their unbelieving partners, and their Adult Children, Infidels, to the Kingdom of God, or to Baptism, the entrance into it till they forsake their Infidelity and declare their Faith and Repentance, which they are unable to do: There is in them an Indisposition that renders them incapable of so Holy a Society, while they are wilful Members of Satan and his Empire ; but in Infants newly born, we meet with no such indisposition. Therefore the Faith and Profession of the Believing Parents, or Sureties, may procure them a Reception by God's allowance into Christ's Kingdom by Baptism. The Goodness of God makes him thus separate Children with their Believing Parents, from the rest of the World, and look upon them as part of his

chose

osen People, by which they become relatively Holy, and differing from unbelievers children. And anciently amongst the Jews, the Faith and Consent of the Father, or of the Witness or Godfather, and of the Congregation, where the Child was Circumcised, was believed by them, to be imputed to the Child his own Faith and Consent; so saith Mr. Ald. de Jure lib. 2. c. 2. They had good ground in the Scripture for this Opinion; for if the Act of Parents, in neglecting the Circumcision of the Children, was reputed theirs, as you may read, *Gen. 17. 14.* much more their Act in bringing them to it, might well be reputed as their Act and Deed.

Now when St. Paul Affirms, *That the unbelieving Husband is Sanctified by the Wife, and the unbelieving Wife is Sanctified by the Husband,* *Cor. 7. 14.* is not to be understood only of their Conversion to the Christian Faith, by the Religious behaviour of the Believing partner; without such a Conversion, the Title of Sanctification cannot properly be allow'd them Persons, while they continue in their unbelief, as the *Apostle* supposes they do, and yet reckons their Children Holy. Therefore conceive this Sanctification ascribed by the *Apostle* to the unbelieving Husband or Wife, in consideration of the Believer, is in relation to the Children, and God's Right and Propriety in them, by reason of the Prerogative of the believing Seed. An Instance we have in *Joseph, who Married Asenath the Daughter*
of

46 *A Vindication of Infant-Baptism,*
of *Potipherah*, an Idolatrous Priest of On,
Heathen Woman; yet *Manasseh* and *Ephraim*
born to him before the years of Famine, Gen.
41. 5. were accounted a Holy Seed, because
their Father was in Covenant with God by
Circumcision, tho' the Issue of a Heathen
Woman. But I shall examine this Text in the
latter end of my reply to Mr. Stennet's Book.

Some of the Fathers and Commentators
judge, this *Holiness* ascribed to Infants of
believing Parents, to be a declaration of their
being Baptized as soon as they were Born,
therefore they were named *Holy*, that is, of the
number of Christs Disciples, Members of his
Church and Kingdom; for the name of *Saints*
and a *federal Holiness*, is often in Scripture
allow'd to the Professors of Christianity. Accord-
ing to this Interpretation, we need no
other Proof from the word of God for In-
fant Baptism.

5. To the Fifth Argument taken from
whole Households mention'd to have been Bap-
tized, *R. M.* makes no answer. But we have
great reason to say, that as the Scripture de-
clares, that entire Families were Baptized
in the Apostles time, without any exception of
Children, if we in our Days practise the
same, and Baptize our Households, we shall
follow the Example of those Primitive Christi-
ans warranted in the word of God, and ap-
proved of by his Holy Spirit.

6. The Sixth Argument is borrow'd from
Acts 2. 39. where *St. Peter*, after he had ex-
hortet

rted the Jews to repent, and to be Baptized
 the forgiveness of their Sins, says, *For*
promise is unto you and to your Children.
M. confidently tells us, *That this promise*
is no other but the promise of the Holy Ghost, of
extraordinary Gifts and Abilities, of Tongues, of
Graces, &c. How such a promise can be pro-
 per, and suit with the Age of Children, and
 how they who cannot speak one Language,
 can have the Gift to speak many, will puzzle
M's. thinking faculty to imagine and dis-
 cover ; neither can we find any such promise
 made to Infants in the *Old Testament* ; there-
 fore *St. Peter's* words relate to the former
 promise of God to Infants, *Gen. 17. 7. I will*
establish my Covenant with thee, and thy Seed after
thee, &c. to be a God unto thee, and thy Seed after
thee. This promise agrees with *St. Peter's* Ex-
 hortation, *Repent and be Baptized every one of*
you in the name of Jesus Christ, for the Remission
of Sins, &c. They being all Adult Persons, were
 all'd upon to repent of the Murder of Christ,
 and of their other Sins, and to be Baptiz'd
 to his Holy Profession for the remission of
 sins: But when he comes to speak of their
 children, he enjoys no repentance to them,
 who were not capable of it, neither did the
 infants of that Age need it, being by their
 entrance into Covenant by Circumcision re-
 leased from original Transgression ; neither
 had they been consenting with their Parents
 to the Death of Christ; therefore to expect
 repentance from them before Baptism, was ri-
 diculous,

48 *A Vindication of Infant-Baptism,*

diculous, and not agreeable with the Apostles Intention. But why does he mention their Children? I answer, the Fathers were Repent and to be Baptiz'd, and to bring their Children with them, or after them into the same Covenant and Profession by Baptism, as the custom of the Proselyted Gentiles, was to carry with them their Children, to be partakers of the same federal Ceremony; as saith St. Peter, *The promise of Grace and Salvation, and of the Remission of Sin, was to them and to their Children.* To Dream upon the Text of the Gift of Miracles unto Babes, is extravagant fancy, that can never enter in the Brains but of some *Whimsical Anabaptist*; neither can we find in the whole Bible any such promise made to them, but to Sons and Daughters, Adult Persons, the Spirit was to be poured out, *Joel 2. 8. Esaiah 44. 3.* for a Spirit as their Age was fit to receive. God requires Repentance from none, but the Adult, guilty of actual Transgressions, and therefore want it. But Infants who never committed any Personal Sins, need nothing but the federal Mercy of God in his Ordinance, to release them from their Primitive Guilt, and Translate them from the polluted State of Nature, into a hopeful State of Grace. To tell us of our Churches requiring Repentance and Faith, as pre-requisit to Baptism, 'tis to be understood from the Adult, as he declares. For the next Question is, *Why are Infants Baptiz'd, when by reason of their*

under Age they cannot perform them? The Answer is, Because they promise them both by their Covenants, which promise, when they come of Age themselves are bound to perform. If our Adversaries quote the Authority of our Church for one thing, they should mention it for another, and be so fair in their Allegations, to not curtail the Text with a Suppression of the principal part that condemns them. R. M. gives no manner of Answer to all the Arguments and Reasons drawn from the words of St. Peter to the converted Jews, but vainly thinks he hath refuted Ten or Twenty Periods with one glance of his imagination, which he judges sufficient; but the truth is, the following Pages are too difficult for him to meddle with: Truth appears there too plain, and shines too bright, for him to venture to obscure it with his idle Exceptions; therefore he passes them over hastily with a thought, and pretends he hath said enough, when he hath said nothing to the purpose.

7. My Seventh is a Question which I offer to our Anabaptists, What method they propose to obtain or procure Salvation for their Infants dying before they come to riper years, otherwise than by Baptism? I have no reason to propose this Question to them, because in their Catechism they acknowledge, That Mankind by their Fall lost Communion with God, are under his Wrath and Curse, and so made liable to all Miseries in this Life, to Death it self, and to the pains of Hell for ever. The

50 *A Vindication of Infant-Baptism,*

same Doctrine is taught in their Confession of Faith: Our first Parents by Sin fell from their Original Righteousness and Communion with God and we in them, &c. They being the root, and by God's appointment standing in the room and stead of all Mankind, the Guilt of the Sin was imputed and corrupted nature conveyed to all their Posterity, descending from them by ordinary Generation being now conceived in Sin, and by nature Children of Wrath, the Servants of Sin, &c. This being the Condition of all Mankind, Young and Old, they allow a Remedy to the Adult the Covenant of Grace by Jesus Christ, an entrance into this Covenant by Baptism according to the prescrib'd Rule; But what will become of the rest of the polluted Old Spring defil'd with original Guilt and Corruption? Don't this Covenant belong to them? Are they to be excluded from an entrance to it? What Salvation can they expect for their Souls, if they dye in that deplorable State before they be ripe enough for their Baptism? Is there any other name under Heaven given among Men whereby we must be saved but the name of Christ? or is there any other method by which we may be interested in that name, but what he has appointed, namely, Baptism? R. M. falls again into his former Dream; that I joyn with the Church of Rome; What he means by saying *I ask a question for my self, I need some Examiner to inform me; for the Question concerns them to answer.* He saith, *The Question needs no answer, but for the sake of the Church*

of Rome, who like himself teach, That Baptism
confers Grace. I am perswaded that R. M's.
scurvy is troubled with some Disease, that re-
presents Men that are White as if they were
yellow or Green; or like that Man in the
Gospel, whose Eyes being half open, saw
men walking in the shape and appearance of
trees. I would willingly anoint his Eyes
with a Salve, or with the Balm of Gilead,
and out of Charity bestow a Groats worth
of Medicine upon him, that he may see clear-
ly. He would find no such Doctrine in my
book, That Baptism confers Grace *ex opere
operato*: Therefore he might have spared his
example of *Simon Magus* for some other An-
tagonist. But this Wise Man of *Gotham* pre-
tends to inform me of the Doctrine of our
Church of which I have been a Teacher a-
bove Forty Years, as if I knew it not, *Sic
ut Minervam Docet*; and quotes half the De-
finition of a Sacrament, and with his usual
furdity thinks he hath met with me, by
saying, *That if Baptism is the sign of an in-
ward and spiritual Grace, 'tis not the Grace it self.*
Very acutely argued, like a most Learned and
University School master. 'Tis as if he should say,
The Body of *R. Morgan* in a Sun shiny day ri-
ng upon an Ass, casts a shadow upon the
ground, but the shadow is not the Man nor
the Ass; well said, 'tis wisely spoken. But
I cannot approve of his mangling the defini-
tion of a Sacrament, and leaving out the
essential part, namely, *An outward and visi-*

52 *A Vindication of Infant-Baptism,*
ble sign of an inward and spiritual Grace, given
to us, ordained by Christ himself, as a means where
by we receive the same, and a Pledge to assure us
thereof. R. M. began the definition very well
but why does he break off? 'tis because he
will not allow Baptism to be a means where
by we receive the inward and spiritual Grace
nor a Pledge to assure us thereof: As if
Christ's Ordinances were only insignificant
signs, unuseful in the Church, and as if what
is there represented were to no purpose
which Doctrine is next kin to Blasphemy.
I have already declared how far the outward
Administration of Baptism is necessarily re
quired in order to our Salvation; therefore
I care not to trouble my Reader with needless
Repetitions. 'Tis a means appointed by
Christ, to declare our acknowledging of him
and his Holy Profession and of our entrance
his Church and Kingdom; 'tis an Instrument
made use of by his Holy Spirit, to work upon
on our Minds, to Seal unto us the Pardon
our Sins, to confirm us in our Religion, and
of his owning us for his People and Disciples.
Therefore St. Paul tells us, *That Christ sanctifieth*
fieth and Cleanseth his Church by the washing
Water and the Word, Eph. 5. 26. Again, *That*
God saveth us according to his Mercy by the
washing of Water, and renewing of the Holy
Ghost; Both are required in order to
Salvation. To this Efficacy of Baptism
agree the words of *Ananias* to St. Paul newly
converted: *Now why tarriest thou, arise and*
Baptism

Baptized and wash away thy Sins, calling on the name of the Lord. The real efficacy of this and the other Sacrament depends chiefly not upon the outward Elements, nor upon the visible Actions ; but principally upon the working of the Holy Spirit in the Souls of the Elect, and their Obedience and Faith concurring. This is to be understood in relation to the Adult, who are capable of Faith and Obedience: But the case of Infants is to be otherwise considered, as I have already taken notice. He saith next, *That the Sacraments are not necessarily conveyers of Grace to the Soul.* If he means by not necessarily, not constantly, then he supposes that sometimes they are conveyers of Grace to the Soul ; if that be his sense, he seems to contradict himself. However he should have let it be understood, whether it were a Physical or moral necessity of conveying Grace that he denies to the Sacraments ; we deny the first as well as he ; but I suppose that his aim is, that there is no necessity for the Sacraments to convey Grace, which he fancies is bestowed upon Infants without the Administration ; to prove this Pernicious Assertion, he could bring either promise or example out of Scripture since the Gospel of Christ, *Deus magnus mihi erit Apollo.* God's Ordinances to be complied with, and Baptism is not to be despised ; without our Obedience to the command of Christ none can expect the benefits there tendred to us, namely, Remission

54 *A Vindication of Infant-Baptism,*
of Sins, entrance into Covenant with God
Admission amongst Christ's Professors,
Church membership, &c. So that tho' Bap-
tism does not confer Grace, 'tis often con-
fer'd unto us and to Infants in Baptism, by
virtue of Christ's institution and promise an-
nexed to his Ordinance, and by the Mercy
and Spirit of God, when we comply with his
Orders and Command. Pray let him hear
how well this Doctrine agrees with other Di-
vines, *Bucan.* in his *Loc. Com.* upon Baptism
speaking of that Text, *Rom. 8. 1.* *There*
non no Condemnation to them that are in Christ
Jesus, faith, That thereby we are to understand
that all Sins are pardon'd in Baptism, both Origin-
al and Actual. He cites a passage out of *S.*
Ambrose, Gratia Dei in Baptismo gratis omnia
condonat: The Grace of God in Baptism freely
forgives all things. This Doctrine is con-
sonant to God's promises, *Zechariah 13.*
In that day there shall be a Fountain opened for
Sin and Uncleanness. I will add one passage
here out of *Mr. Calvin's Inst. l. 4. c. 16. v. 8.*
speaking of the usefulness of Infant Baptism
he says to those who fancy'd the Promise of
God sufficient to confirm their Salvation
They who embrace the promise of the Mercy
God granted to their Childrer, let them remem-
ber that 'tis their Duty to sign them with the Seal
of that Mercy, and to bring them into the Church
and by that means to encourage them to a greater
assurance, because they plainly see the Covenant
of the Lord applyed to the Bodies of their Child-

Children, and the Children also receive no small benefit from their Baptism; for they are thereby initiated into the Church, and are to be more considered than other Members. Afterwards, when they come to Age, they are thereby the more excited to a Serious and Earnest Worship of God, because they were by him receiv'd to the publick Seal of their Adoption before their Age would suffer them to know their Father. Finally, that threatening ought to terrify us, that God will punish every one that shall neglect to mark his Son with the Seal of the Covenant; because by that contempt he scorns, and as it were renounces the Grace or Favour that is offered. Is this Famous Reformer of the Christian Church a Papist, for saying, *That Children receive no small benefit from their Baptism, &c?*

Now at last he comes to the Question, which all this while he waved with his idle Suspicion of Popery. The Question, which he hath altered, is, *Since all new Born Children are not by Nature within the Covenant, by what means can they expect to become partakers of the Redemption by Jesus Christ, otherwise than by his Ordinance of Baptism?* To this he makes no satisfactory answer, and leaves them to God's disposal, and us in the Dark in relation to their future State, if they die without Baptism. 'Tis true, Christ hath said, *That of such is the Kingdom of God*; but this was not spoken of any, but of those who were brought to him, or who were to come to him in that method that he hath appointed in his Church for

56 *A Vindication of Infant-Baptism,*

their Reception ; to these indeed he declares his gracious intention towards them with respect to Salvation ; But where can we find that Christ hath revealed this gracious intention to Children, who were out of the Covenant ; to the Infants of Heathens and Unbelievers, or to such as are kept off from their participation of the Salvation purchased by Christ's Death ? On the contrary, under the former dispensation God ordred Children to be cut off from their People, who had not the Seal of the Covenant within a prefixed time ; he adds, *Let God apply Pardon to them in his own way ;* And what is that way ? We say, That way is revealed ; for we are not left in the Dark in relation to Salvation either for our selves or Children : We have a method appointed for both, a sure word of Prophecy. The Scripture plainly declares, That there is no Salvation but in God's blessed Son, *Acts 4. 12.* Our Infants must be related to him as well as our selves if we expect Redemption for them or the remission of Original Sin. No forgiveness to be expected from God without Christ, no admittance to Heaven without an Interest in this blessed Mediator, and great Steward of the Divine Favours, and eternal Blessings. Now he hath appointed Rules on earth for us to observe, to obtain a share and interest in him and his Redemption, and to be initiated into his Mystical Body, the Church. To expect any other way not revealed, or to hope for the

benefit

Benefits either for our selves or Children, when we despise the Means, is an excess of Folly, Presumption, Ingratitude and Madness; or to offer to dispose of Salvation and Heaven to those, who wilfully are excluded by their Parents neglect, or scorn of Christ's Institution, is a Boldness not justifiable before God or Man.

R. M. proceeds on in the usual Cant of his Sect, *That 'tis not likely that God should venture their Salvation on so precarious a thing as Baptism, which may or may not be administred, &c.* This is after his wonted impertinent and irreligious Strain. 'Tis not God that ventures; for he hath prescribed a Method for the Salvation of Infants, and may save them without it; but 'tis not safe for us to venture on that which is not revealed, and to neglect the appointed Method. He tells us next, *Seeing we have no Warrant from the Word of God to baptize them to this end, &c.* Here he returns to, and begs the former Question. Is it probable that God in his Holy Word should declare and discover a Method of Salvation for the Adult, and not for Children? and leave them in the corrupt State of Nature, without any Assurance or Means of Mercy, and Remission of Original Sin? We say. and have sufficiently proved, That we have a lawful and express Warrant, and sufficient Authority from Christ, to Baptize Infants, intelligible to all but such as the Spirit of Error hath blinded their Understandings, that they

C 5

should

58 *A Vindication of Infant-Baptism,*
should not perceive the Truth. We seek no other way to save our Children, and to remedy their Natural Corruption, but that which God and Christ hath appointed, to procure them an Interest in our Redeemer, and his Redemption, by a Visible Introduction into his Covenant; To what he says, *That I have mistaken the Place, That St. Peter joyns Repentance and Baptism together for the Remission of Sins.* I answer, *St. Peter* speaks to the Adult *Jews*, and enjoyns them to Repent and be Baptized; but when he ascribes the Promise of the Covenant to their Children, there is not one Syllable of Repentance required from them, nor does he delay the Benefits of the Promise till they could Repent. Their Children being Circumcised as probably they all were, they were within the former Covenant; they had not actually transgress'd, therefore they needed then no Repentance. But *St. Peter* declares, that by virtue of God's former Promise, they had a Right to the New Covenant, and therefore to the Seal of it, which was Baptism. But 'tis the common practice of our Adversaries, to confound the State of the Adult with that of Infants: And 'tis a bold Venture, to delay the means of Salvation of Children till they come of Age, and keep them off from Christ, till they can make a personal Profession of Faith and Repentance, when their Parents know not how soon Death may snatch them out of their Embraces. What will become

become of them when they die in the polluted State of Nature, is not known to us, nor any. Let not Parents hazard the eternal Welfare of their Little Ones upon such Uncertainties not revealed, upon the Mistakes and Misapprehensions of a deluded and new *Sect*, that proceeds from the Devil, to deceive Mankind and destroy Souls.

My last Argument is taken from the Words of Christ to *Nicodemus*, *John 3. 5. Except a Person, or a Man, be born of Water and the Spirit, he cannot enter into the Kingdom of God.* From whence indeed I infer the necessity of Infant-Baptism, in order to Salvation. In opposition to this Inference, *R. M.* produces the Comment of a Learned Man, who it seems was not altogether infallible; *Mr. Charnock*, a stiff and Zealous Dissenter from our Church, and one whose Principles we judge not altogether Orthodox.

'Tis strange, saith he, that when all agree that the Birth spoken of here is spiritual and metaphorical, that the Water here should be natural. To reply to this Learned Man: All do not agree to what he says; And 'tis much more strange, that this Spiritual Birth chiefly intended, and that requires by Christ's own Words, two necessary means or conditions, our Obedience to the outward Ordinance, and the spiritual blessing, should have but one in the Opinion of this Doctor, and that his Learning should make our Wise Saviour guilty of Tautology. To understand this, and all other Texts of Holy

60 *A Vindication of Infant-Baptism,*

Holy Scripture, it concerns us to examine and weigh the Circumstances: Christ, who put such a Value upon *John's* Baptism, because it was of God, that he submitted to it, reckon'd it part of that Righteousness, that he was, and the *Jews* were, in imitation of him, bound to fulfil, was speaking to *Nicodemus* a *Pharisee*, a Despiser of *John's* Baptism: When he was perswaded by Christ's Works and Miracles, that he was a Teacher come from God, and therefore was desirous to be instructed by him. The first Lesson our Saviour recommends to him is, *To be born again*, without which Birth none can see the Kingdom of God; this Saying puzzled the Learned *Pharisee*, which made him ask, *How can a Man be born again, when he is old?* &c. for he apply'd the Saying to himself. Our Redeemer explains in the next Words, the Mystery of this New Birth, and requires two necessary Particulars in the accomplishment of it, Water and the Spirit; That is, the Baptism of Water, the Baptism of *John*, or an outward compliance and submission to that Ordinance, appointed by God for Men to use in order, and for the obtaining his inward Blessing, and a Disposition fit for his Kingdom together with the Renovation of his Holy Spirit 'Tis not probable, that they who despise the one should obtain the other; for 'tis to affront God's Wisdom and Power, to neglect the outward Means now'd and stamp'd by his Divine Authority.

Mos

Most of the *Pharisees* were guilty of this Crime; for, *They rejected the Counsel of God against themselves, being not baptized of him,* Luke 7. 30. For this Reason Christ requires from *Nicodemus*, If he desired to be admitted into the Kingdom of God, That he should be born both of Water and the Spirit; that is, that he should be baptized with Water, and sanctified by the Spirit. That Phrase is frequently used by the Primitive Fathers in that sense, they call Baptism a *Regeneration*, a *New Birth*; because 'tis an Entrance into a New State, the State of Grace. Another Reason is alledged against this Interpretation: *None could be saved unless baptized, if this were meant of Baptism.* Several of the ancient Fathers were of that Opinion: But I answer, That God by these Words, tho' he binds us to the observance of his outward Ordinances, by which he is pleased to distribute his Spiritual Mercies, he is a free Agent, and binds not himself: Therefore, according to the ordinary Method or Course, none can be saved unless baptized: But God's Mercy can save them in an extraordinary manner unknown to us, upon which we are not presumptuously depend. He endeavours to confirm his Reason with the Text of *John 6. 53. Except ye eat the Flesh of the Son of Man, and drink his Blood, ye have no Life in you.* 'Tis unquestionable, that this eating and drinking is Spiritual, and not Oral; therefore there can be no just Comparison between a Text that

62 *A Vindication of Infant-Baptism,*

that requires Elemental Water, and the other a Spiritual Manducation and Food perceptible only by Faith. For the other Text, *Mark 16. 16. He that believeth, and is baptized, shall be saved,* contradicts his Exposition, That *Christ lays not the stress upon Baptism; but upon Faith.* While both are required in our New Birth, according to his Confession here, Why does he exclude Water and mention only the Spiritual Birth by Faith and the Spirit? He tells us next, to invalidate the Interpretation by Water-Baptism *That the Baptism of Water was not then a standing Sacrament in the Christian Church.* I answer, The Christian Church was not then in being, while the Jewish Oeconomy continued which lasted till the Death and Resurrection of Christ, *Eph. 2. 14. Matt. 23. 2, 3.* And tho' the Baptism of Christ was not then in force, that of John was to be complied with by all God's People in the Jewish Church, to prepare them for the Reception of the *Messiah.* And what Christ saith in relation to John's Baptism, ought with more reason to be understood of his own Baptism; for both were required in their several Times by the same Authority of our God. Again he saith, *Those that understand it of Baptismal Water, and so make it of absolute necessity, do by another Assertion accuse their own Exposition of falsity; for they say that the Baptism of Blood, i. e. Martyrdom supplies the want of Water.* We say so, when Water cannot lawfully be procur'd, and when

is not despised nor neglected, and Persons
 hurried out of the World in a violent
 persecution, before they can be baptiz'd, as
 several of the Ancients were. 'Tis Water,
 with he, is express'd, and Blood is not Water.
 Who knows not what this Learned Expositor
 firms? Therefore he confidently concludes,
 that one of these Assertions must be false. A
 pitiful conclusion from false Suppositions!
 We lay no such necessity upon Water-
 baptism as he conceives, as I have often
 said; tho' God requires us to use the Means
 appointed, he can save with or without the
 means, at his Pleasure, and is not confin'd
 himself, tho' he confines us by his express
 command. If this Learned Commentator
 can reason no better, I desire R. M. to keep
 him for himself, as his Oracle; we shall not
 consult him in difficult Matters, nor follow
 his Exposition that is false and ridiculous.
 Against so learned a Commentator I shall op-
 pose the Exposition of a more Learned Man:
 Dr. Lightfoot in his *Hor. Hebr.* p. 77. upon
 his Text: *Docet Judaeum non intrandum in
 regnum Messiae, nisi primo per transitionem ex
 Judaico in Evangelicum per Baptismum &
 in ex Carnali in Spiritualem. Per aquam deno-
 tatur Baptismum parum dubito, &c.* Christ
 teaches, that a Jew cannot enter into the
 Kingdom of the Messiah, unless he first
 passeth from the Jewish State to an Evan-
 gelical, by Baptism, and afterwards from
 Carnal to a Spiritual. That by Water is
 signi-

64 *A Vindication of Infant-Baptism,*
 signified Baptism, I make no question. But my Antagonist goes on boldly, to tell us, *That 'tis certain Water is often in Scripture taken for the renewing, cleansing, and refreshing Operation of the holy Spirit.* But this is false, There are but few Texts where the Word Water is to be understood in a Spiritual Sense, John 4. 14. for the saving Grace of the Spirit of God; but then there is always an Epithet that distinguishes it from the common Water for 'tis call'd a *living Water*, v. 10. and John 7. 38. *He that believeth in me, as the Scripture hath said, out of his Belly shall flow Rivers of living Water:* But this spake he of the Spirit, which they that believe on him should receive. Water, without an Adjunct is cold and comfortless, and is so far from being a proper Metaphor of Joy and Comfort, that on the contrary 'tis more fit to represent Sorrow and Affliction, as *Isaiah* 30. 20. And *Psal.* 18. 16. *God drew me out of many Waters.* Therefore to take the Water of this Text in a Spiritual and Figurative Sense is a false and erroneous Exposition, neither agreeing with the Design of our Saviour, nor the Context.

R. M. in the next place spies something that he calls New and Strange, And what is it? However, as the Intent of Baptism was to enter us into the State of Grace, and seal to us the Pardon of our Sins, and a Title to the Divine Favour, it may with a great deal of Reason be styled a *New Birth*, without any regard to the

Birt

Birth of the Spirit. Against this Doctrine my learned Adversary brings neither Reason nor scripture to oppose it, but only his own erroneous Sentiments ; and breaks out into an Ecclamation, as if that were a sufficient Refutation. Now to justify this Position, I wou'd ask *M.* What was the Intent of our Saviour, in this Institution of Baptism, if not to enter us thereby into his Church and Kingdom? which is the State of Grace, I understand. Is it not to seal to us the Pardon of our Sins, and a Title to the Divine Favour? For these Reasons I conclude, that the outward Administration alone may be stiled a New Birth, or an Entrance into a New State ; this is the Name that the Fathers, and several Modern Divines give to it. The Birth of Water, and the Birth of the Spirit ought to be inseparable ; but we find them distinct in the Word of God, and the one without the other. *Simon Magus* believed and was baptized, and continued sometime with *Philip* in the Profession of Christianity ; yet we cannot say of him, that he was born of the Spirit ; his Hypocrisy will not suffer us to have such a good Opinion of him : Yet he was admitted into the Fellowship of the rest of Christians, and by his Baptism was intituled at least to all the outward Privileges belonging to them, and was enrolled amongst the subjects of Christ's Kingdom by the Baptism of Water, tho' an unsincere and a false Professor. Here outward Baptism sealed to him many

66 *A Vindication of Infant-Baptism,*

many Advantages; therefore we may look upon him as one born of Water, but not of the Spirit. Did *R. M.* understand what Baptism is, he would not have been moved to wonder, and quarrel at my Orthodox Hypothesis. Let me inform him again, That 'tis a religious Ceremony of Initiation into God's Kingdom; a Sacrament appointed by Christ to seal to the Person admitted the Remission of Sins, *Acts* 2. 38. and 22. 16. and there by a Title to the Divine Favour. We cannot think the Administration is in vain which Christ hath ordained; he is not wanting to his own Institution, if we render not our selves unworthy of his Mercy. Now in Children we cannot find any thing that may be repugnant to the goodness of God, or may stop the Current of his Mercy promised to our Obedience to his Holy Ordinance; therefore we have Reason, as our Church teaches, to be perswaded, that it takes them out of the State of Nature, and enters them into a State of Grace; seals to them the Pardon of their Sins, and a Title to the Divine Favour, which is the New Birth that I mentioned. For the Birth of the Spirit, we find it without the outward Birth of Water, in *Cornelius* and his Company converted by *St. Peter's* Preaching, *Acts* 10. While Peter yet spake, the Holy Ghost fell on them which heard the Word, and they spake with Tongues, and they magnified God. Here the Birth of the Spirit, before ever Water was

administred; yet the Apostle Judges it need-
ful, that the other should follow. Can any
Man forbid Water, that these should not be
baptized, which have received the Holy Ghost, as
well as we? v. 47. And that R. M. may un-
derstand, that I deliver nothing but the Per-
suasion of our Church, let him consult the
Rubrick of Baptism, there he shall meet with
Confirmation of this Truth that I maintain,
which the Thirty-nine Articles more plainly
express. The Sacraments ordained of Christ
are not only Badges or Tokens of Christian Mens
Profession, but rather they be certain sure Wit-
nesses and effectual Signs of Grace, and God's
good Will towards us, by the which he doth work
invisible in us, &c. And of Baptism we find
these Words, Baptism is not only a Sign of Pro-
fession and Mark of difference, whereby Christian
Men are discerned from others that be not
Christen'd; but it is also a Sign of Regeneration
or New Birth, whereby, as by an Instrument,
they that receive Baptism rightly, are grafted into
the Church, the Promises of the Forgiveness of Sin,
and of our Adoption to be the Sons of God, by
the Holy Ghost, are visibly sign'd and seal'd, &c.
I appeal to all Men of Reason, whether I
say any tittle from the Orthodox Faith of
the Church of England. And Doctor Featley
tells us from Solinus, of a River in Bæotia,
that turneth Sheep of any Colour to be
White, when washed in it, That may be a
parable, saith he, but this is a Gospel Truth. Such
is the Vertue of this Consecrated Water in Baptism,
wherein

68 *A Vindication of Infant-Baptism,*

wherein Christ's Lambs are usually washed through
 Divine Benediction in that Ordinance, that they
 they were never so black or foul before, yet after
 they come out of the Water, they are most clean
 and white, and so continue, till they plunge them-
 selves into the Mire of fleshly Lusts. Peter
 Martyr upon this Subject speaks plain, *Clavis*
 4. Cap. 8. *de Pado-baptismo*. Whereas Christian
 Infants are declared by the Word of God to have
 the Promise of the Covenant, and to be within
 the Church, this Participation and Promise
 sealed to them by Baptism. Likewise Wende-
 linus in his Christian Theology, l. 1. cap. 22.
 The principal End of Baptism is to signify, and
 seal, and sacramentally to represent the Remission
 of Sins, Regeneration, and our Union with
 Christ, as also consequently a Mutual Union
 the Baptized. I will add one Passage more
 out of Mr. Baxter's Book against Mr. Tombs
 in his Preface concerning Infants Church
 Membership: Signs cannot by Moral Operations
 be Instruments of a real Change on Infants, but
 only of a Relative. And a little after: The
 Infants are not capable of every Benefit by Baptism
 as are the Aged, yet they are capable of the
 Principal Ends: That it may be a Sign to enter
 them Church-Members, and solemnize their De-
 dication to Christ, and engage them to be his
 People, and to take him for their Lord and Sa-
 viour; so to confer on them Remission of Sins
 and what Christ by the Covenant promiseth to the
 Baptized; yet tho' themselves understand not this
 even as we put the Names of Infants in Bona

and Leases. which they can neither read nor know
And Mr. Charnock, an Author approved
my Antagonist, saith on John 3. 5.
regeneration is the Mystery and Sense of the
sacred Ceremony. 'Tis indeed signified, repre-
sented, and sealed in Baptism, how he does not
terminate. Therefore is this the New and
strange Doctrine so frightful to R. M. that
is so agreeable with the Belief and Perswa-
sion of all other Orthodox Divines of all
sects and Divisions?

For the Names of *Godfathers* and *God-
mothers* I have set down in divers Languages,
to shew what esteem other Nations have of
that ancient Custom, as old as the Jewish
Church, by the Honourable Titles that they
bestow upon those Charitable Friends, who
present Infants to the Baptismal Font, that
much of our Sectaries, who have abolished this
honourous and Godly Practice, may understand
how they differ, not only from our establish'd
Church, but also from all other Orthodox
Churches in the World. 'Tis not to make
any Ostentation of my Knowledge in these
Tongues, as R. M. vainly and maliciously
approaches me.

Concerning the Word *κατὰ λου*, R. M. is
a *Non plus* about my meaning, when I
affirm that its natural signification implies a
Dipping or Washing than *κατὰ λου*, and is
frequently understood in a larger Sense by
the Masters of the Greek Tongue, and in the
Word of God, for any kind of Washing,
Sprink-

70 *A Vindication of Infant-Baptism,*
Sprinkling, or Cleansing, where there is
Dipping or total Immersion. This I am to
prove, and *R. M.* waits for my Explication, as
he says ; for he tells us, that *he knows no Greek*
Author, that uses the Word in any other sense than
to dip or plunge, and so to wash by such dipping.
I am partly of his Opinion in one thing, That *he*
knows no Greek Author, &c. For I believe *he*
never read any, neither understands the
Language ; if he had, he would never have
told us that *μαρτάω* signifies to teach ; and
would have been more skill'd in the Practice
of the Schools, and known how to distinguish
between a Scholar and a Master, between
Learning and Teaching. But as my Task is
to prove, by some approved *Greek Author*
that *κατίζω* signifies to sprinkle, I will define
him, or some intelligent Person in that
Tongue, for him, to consult *Eusebius, Lib. 3.*
Cap. 20. or in the *Paris Edition 23* where
he shall find a young Man converted by
St. John, committed to the Tuition of a
Bishop, who some time after baptized him
but he returning to his former Trade of a
licentious Life became a Captain of Thieves
and forsook his Tutor. When *St. John* came
to require him of the Bishop, he understood
of his Relapse into the same disorderly
Living, which caused him to seek him out
to reclaim him. The Thief at the sight of
St. John fled from him ; but being perswaded
by the Apostle's kind Invitation to draw
nearer to him, with Promises of Pardon

embraced the old Man, and answer'd well as he could for weeping, *So that again seem'd to be baptized with tears.* Can any man make sense of these Words, by understanding the Word baptized again, for plunged or dipt with Tears? 'Tis impossible to take this Expression but for Sprinkling in a primary Signification, and for washing in a secondary and consequential. Now here are Three Arguments deducable from this Text, to prove the Word *baptizo* to signify, *I sprinkle*: First, none can be said to be plunged or dipped with Tears, or in tears, but only sprinkled with Tears; for the Eyes cannot afford so vast a quantity to immerse the whole Body. Again, when the first Baptism is compared by the Author to his sprinkling the Face with Tears, 'tis an evident Testimony, that the first Baptism was perform'd without dipping, in a manner something answerable to this second Baptism, which is to be understood of Sprinkling, and not of Dipping; otherwise the Author's comparison had been defective, and not proper. But there is another Argument, that the next Words afford to prove the Mode of baptism was then by Sprinkling; for 'tis said, *That the Thief seem'd to be baptized again with tears.* *Μονὴν ἀποκρύπτων τὴν Νεκρίαν.* *The Right hand only omitted or conceal'd.* Does not this expression plainly discover how Baptism was perform'd by the Christians of those Days, by the Hand of the Minister, who was to shake

72 *A Vindication of Infant-Baptism,*

shake the Water upon the baptized Person and considering his Face, how 'twas sprinkled with Tears; *Eusebius* affirms, That he seem'd to be again baptized with Tears the Office of the Minister, or the Right Hand, that should have baptized him, omitted. How can any dipping be here understood? I appeal to all Men of reason to judge of this Quotation, whether this *Greek* Author does not represent this Thief Baptism without Immersion, or plunging over Head and Ears; a Practice not used at first but by the superstitious *Jews*, and by such Christians as were fond of, and imitated their Actions and Customs, as we shall take notice elsewhere.

I undertake not to justify the Truth of this Relation, I am only to observe the Expression of this *Greek* Author, who understands Baptism for Sprinkling in this Text. And it may deserve our Observation, that divers Verbs in that Language ending in *ίζω* are the diminutives of other Verbs, as *παίζω*, I strike in earnest, *παίζω*, I strike in jest, and in sport, as in Children's play: *σεβίζω*, I adore, *σεβίζω*, I worship with less respect: *ωσίζω*, I drive softly, from *ωθίζω*, I drive with violence; *κοσπίζω*, I separate a little, from *κόσφω*, asunder; *νομίζω*, I judge or esteem in diminutive sense. So likewise from *βάπτω*, I plunge, or immerse, or Dip, is derived *εμβαπτίζω*, which signifies a lesser washing, or application of Water by sprinkling or otherwise.

But I have that Kindness for my Adversary, tho' he is uncivil, to gratify him with another Quotation; and if he desires, with many more out of good Authors, to prove, that *κατὰ λιβαν* signifies to sprinkle, as well as to dip, and a lesser washing than *ἐκλύω*, the Radix of *κατὰ λιβαν*. In the 6th Book of *Eusebius*, c. 42. he shall find there, in a Letter of *Cornelius* Bishop of *Rome*, to *Fabius* Bishop of *Antioch*, that *Novatus*, when he was like to dye was Baptized in the Bed where he lay: How can this sick Man be plunged or dipped over Head and Ears in Water, when he lay in his Bed? If Baptism did always signify Immersion, such a one could never be said to be Baptized. Some indeed have observed, that *Cornelius* seems to disapprove of this manner of Baptizing; but if we examine the Historian, we shall find the cause of his dislike, was not because he had not been dipped, but because he obtain'd not, after his recovery, that which he should have had according to the Canon of the Church, to wit, Confirmation by the Hands of the Bishop. I know that they who deferr'd their Baptism till a Sick or a Death-bed, were severely reproved by the Fathers of the Primitive Church, and noted with the Title of *Clipeati*, not because Aspersions or Affusions of Water, was not a sufficient Baptism, for it was the approved Custom of those Times in such Cases; but because those faint-hearted Christians were loth to leave their Vices,

D

and

74 *A Vindication of Infant-Baptism,*
and engage themselves to observe the exact
Rules of Christianity, till the latter end of
their Days, hoping then by Baptism to ob-
tain the full forgiveness of all their former
Sins. The scandalous Lives of those Men,
occasion'd the Canon to be publish'd, That
such should not be admitted into Holy
Orders, without great necessity; and not be-
cause they were Baptized by sprinkling, as
Bishop *Taylor*, quoted by Mr. *Stennet*, seems
to intimate; for it appear'd by deferring
Baptism till the last Moment, as they suppo-
sed, that they were unwilling to lead a regu-
lar Life, and to forsake their beloved Sins.
Neither doth Mr. *Stennet* fairly represent that
Quotation; for he leaves out the Principal
Cause of his Exception, the Omission of Con-
firmation by the Hands of the Bishop, ac-
cording to the Canon. I might add divers
other Examples of Confessors and Martyrs,
Baptized in Prisons and in Chains; these were
all sprinkled, as *Laurentius* and *Lucillus*, and
a Number of others mention'd in the Eccle-
siastical Histories; for they had not the Con-
veniency of Pools, Baths, Ponds or Rivers
to perform the Ceremony in their Confinement,
nor is it probable that their Heathen
Keepers would allow them the free Liberty
to perform their Christian Ceremonies. Like-
wise if we inquire into the Method of Baptiz-
ing publicly the *Catechumeni* in the Fac-
es of the Primitive Congregations in divers
Churches, it was not by dipping the whole
Body

Body, but by pouring of Water upon the Face, or by dipping the Head and Face into the Font ; for that purpose we read, they hang'd their Head over it for to perform this Immersion : Therefore yet at *Jerusalem* is to be seen a little Stone Font, in possession of the *Syrians*, which, as Tradition informs, was used by the Holy Apostles in Baptizing Men and Women, as Mr. *Henry Maundrel*, Chaplain to the Factory of *Aleppo*, tells us in his Journal, Page 98. Therefore this Ancient Monument, where 'tis not possible to dip the whole Body, agrees not with a Total Immersion, which Mr. *Stennet* affirms to be the constant Usage of the Primitive and Modern Churches of the East. And St. *Chrysostom* representing the Mode of publick Baptism used in his Time, saith, *The old Man is buried and drown'd, when we plunge the Head in Water, in a Sepulchre.* On *John 3. 5.* Mr. *Stennet* purposely omits this plunging of the Head in Water, in the *English* Version, tho' he cites it in *Latin*, Page 153. For this shews, that Dipping or Immersion was used in the Primitive Times by some Churches, I cannot find any Example in all the Ancient Records, of a Total Immersion of the whole Body in the sight of the Publick Congregation, where the *Catechumeni* were usually Baptized ; for it had been an unseemly Sight, if so many young Men, Virgins, and others of the Female Sex, had been Baptized or Plunged into the Water naked or half naked, in the Pre-

76 *A Vindication of Infant-Baptism,*

sence of so many Eyes. The Practice had been too scandalous and immodest for any civil People, whatever the Patrons and Advocates of the *Dipping-Sett* may pretend; and doubtless some of their Enemies would have taken notice of it, and interpreted that Practice to their Disadvantage and Disgrace, and left it upon Record. If any used a total Immersion, it cannot be proved to be the Universal Practice of the Eastern Churches of Christ, nor is it admitted amongst the *Abyssines* to this Day. If it had been an Apostolick Tradition, there it had continued without controul, for that hot Country can have no Excuse for the omission or change of Dipping the whole Body into Asperision, which is now their constant Usage at Baptism. If Naked Men and Women must thus promiscuously appear publicly before a Congregation, to be Immersed over Head and Ears, they must first renounce all Modesty. If clothed, tho' with a thin Garment, 'tis their Habit that is, by Dipping, to speak properly, Baptized, and not their Person, as *Vossius* observes: *Baptismus non est Immersio Vestimentum sed humani Corporis*: Baptism is not the plunging of the Garments, but of the human Body. Here we may observe, that this Word *baptize*, which I have proved to signify Sprinkling, is not employ'd in the Word of God in any common Use, but either in a Religious or Superstitious Practice, and where the Power and Mercy of God is to

exerc

exert it self, who wants not the Quantity of Water, nor that Circumstance of Dipping, to produce the desir'd and promis'd Effect.

Again, We may observe in the *Latin* Fathers, they frequently use the Word *Tingere*, to express the Action of Baptism, which answers to the Verb *Baptizein*, and signifies a slight Dipping or Touching of the Water, not a total Immersion, as some Idolaters of Dipping fanſie; or else it signifies to dye, or alter the Colour or Property. Then it relates to the Spiritual Efficacy and Benefits of that Christian Laver, where the Soul is Totally Immersed and Dyed in the Blood of Christ; witness the Words of *Gregory*, Bishop of Rome: *Baptisma Græco eloquio dicitur quod Tinctio quia ibi Homo Spiritu Gratiae in melius immutatur & longe aliud quam erat efficitur; Primum enim sœdi eramus deformitate peccatorum, in ipsa Tinctione reddimur pulchri dealbatione virtutum*: Baptism in *Greek* is the same as *Tinctio* in *Latin*, for there a Man is chang'd for the better, and becomes altogether another Person, before we were defiled with the Pollution of Sins; but in this Laver we are render'd Beautiful or Clean, with the Whiting of Christian Vertues. In this Quotation my Antagonist may take notice, that this excellent Christian and Orthodox Bishop, Sirnam'd *Thaumaturgos*, a Worker of Miracles, who abhorred the Title of Universal Bishop, ascribes more to Baptism than I do,

78 *A Vindication of Infant-Baptism,*
and yet is not for the *Opus Operatum* of the
present Church of *Rome*. Truly, all the
Primitive Fathers, when they speak of
Baptism, extol the efficacy of it through the
Grace of God, by naming it, *Illuminating*
Enlightning, Regeneration, New Birth, &c
Therefore my Adversaries need not be so
much offended at my saying, That the out-
ward Administration of Baptism is to be
born again of Water, since this Doctrine
is taught by Christ and the Catholicks of all
Ages and Nations.

But methinks, the Proofs that I have al-
leged to convince him, That the Word
Baptize is used in another Sense than Dipping
or Plunging, should be sufficient to perswade
him, a Truth so evident and so well agreeing
with the Texts of the Word of God, which
he judiciously despises, and which he must
give me leave again to examine. In *Mark*
7. 4. 'tis unreasonable to fantasie any Dipping.
The *Jews* indeed were very superstitious in
their Washings and Cleansings with Water,
as the *Mahumetans* are to this Day: They
were very nice to purify all Parts of their
Body with that Element. But can any ra-
tional Person think, that they proceeded to
that Degree of Superstition in all Times and
Seasons, in Winter as well as Summer, in
Frost and Snow, as often as they came from
the Market, to dip themselves over Head and
Ears in Water, Men and Women, with their
long Hair, before their Dinner: Their
Heads

Heads could not be dry in half a Day, and by such a Practice they might have endanger'd their Healths. Besides, 'tis to be consider'd, that divers Towns and Houses had no such Conveniency of Water, being situated upon Hills, and were forced to supply themselves from Wells and Fountains at a distance, as *Berhulia* in *Judith*, and a City of *Samaria* call'd *Sychar*, *John* 4. 5. and others. Neither could every Dwelling have a Pond, or a Bath convenient for such a Purpose: Therefore this Exposition of our Adversary's is altogether improbable, if not absurd and ridiculous. I confess with Mr. *Beza* and Mr. *Pool*, that sometimes *κατιζοντας* may be more than *χερίπλυν*, to wash the Hands; they must give me leave to dissent from them in some Particulars, where they dissent from the Holy Scripture. For I suppose they washed their Faces, their Eyes that had seen the ungodly, their Feet and Legs, and all naked Parts exposed to the Infection and Pollution of the Common People; the rest of their Body was defended and cover'd by their Garments. This I judge to be the Meaning of the *κατιζοντας* of that Text, which I prove by *Peter's* Saying to Christ, *John* 13. 9. *Simon Peter saith to him, Lord, not my Feet only, but also my Hands and my Head.* Why should he mention the Washing of his Hands and his Head only, and not his other Limbs, but that it was the common practice of the Jews to baptize and purify those naked Parts

80 *A Vindication of Infant-Baptism,*

of their Body, at their return from the Markets. This Exposition agrees with what is said, *John 2. 6.* That at the Marriage of *Cana of Galilee*, There were six Water-pots of Stone, after the manner of the purifying of the Jews, containing two or Three Firkins a-piece. No Man of Sense will imagine that they were for Dipping or Plunging the Persons of the House over Head and Ears : It was impossible that they could be totally Immersed in so narrow a Compass : Yet these Water-pots were there for the same purpose, to baptize them who came from abroad, and purify them according to their general Custom. So likewise we are to understand, *Luke 11. 38.* when Christ was invited to a *Pharisee's* House to Dinner, *He went in and sat down to Meat. And when the Pharisee saw it, he marvelled,* *ὅτι ἔσρωτον ἐβαπτίζον ἀπὸ τοῦ ἀγίου,* that he had not been baptized or washed before Dinner. Can any Man of sense understand this Word *ebaptishe* in the Original, to be Dipped over Head and Ears, as Mr. Stennet would always have the Word baptized, turn'd into English : 'Tis truly almost as ridiculous to imagine, as the Practice would seem ridiculous to Men of Reason, that any People were arrived to that Degree of Superstition, to plunge themselves in Pools and Ponds at every time they eat Meat ; they rather washed their Faces, their Eyes, Hands and naked Limbs. This is express'd in Holy Scripture by the Word *Baptizing*; for a Total Immersion cannot here be

be understood. And it is likewise remarkable, to undeceive our Adversaries, when any Dipping is signified in the Old Testament, in the Septuagint the Word *Baptizein* is not employ'd, but *Baptein*, to dip as *Exod. 12. 22.* *ἀνίψετε δὲ τὴν δίσκον υἱοῦ ὕδατος καὶ βάψαντες ἀπὸ τοῦ αἵματος,* &c. And ye shall take a Bunch of Hyssop, and dip it in the Blood, that is, in the Bason, &c. So *Levit. 4. 6.* καὶ λαβὼν ὁ ἱερεὺς βάψει τὸν δάκτυλον εἰς τὸ αἶμα. The Priest shall dip his Finger in the Blood. And *Luke 16. 24.* 'Tis the Rich Man's Request to his Father Abraham, to send Lazarus, ἵνα βάψῃ τὸ ἄκρον τοῦ δακτύλου αὐτοῦ ὕδατος. &c. That he might dip the Tip of his Finger in Water, &c. Many other Texts might be alledged out of the Word of God, to prove, that when Dipping is to be express'd, the Verb *βάπτειν*, not *βαπτίζειν*, is frequently used. Therefore Dr. Lightfoot expounds the former Words of *Luke 11. 38.* in this manner, That the Dipping of the whole Body is not to be here understood, may be proved sufficiently; because such a Dipping was not practised, but where there was a Defilement from the Principal Causes of Uncleaness. In another place of his *Hor. Hebr.* Baptism is not always to be interpreted Dipping, somethings were to be dipped, others to be washed, others to be sprinkled, *Hor. Hebr.* on *Mark 7.* And if we may interpret one Text of Holy Scripture by another, we may find out the Meaning of St. Luke's Word *Ebaptishe*, by the Pharisees Reprehension of Christ's Disciples, *Matth.*

82 *A Vindication of Infant-Baptism,*

15. 2. *Why do thy Disciples transgress the Tradition of the Elders? for they wash not their Hands when they eat Bread.* This was the Cause of the Pharisees wonder, when he saw that Christ neglected this Tradition of the Elders, which is expressed by ὁ παλαιὸς τῶν ἑβραίων ἡ δὲ τῶν ἀποστόλων.

I would willingly inform the fond Idolaters of Dipping at Baptism, That there are divers *Greek Words* in the *Septuagint*, and in the Writings of the *Apostles*, used in a Sense not altogether agreeing with the *Heathen Authors*, but suitable to the Purpose of the Spirit of God. We may again observe, that Words often change their signification in a few Years: For example, The Word *Tyrannos* in the ancient Authors, is an ordinary Word for a *Prince* or *Governour*, and was not then offensive; but now 'tis a Name of Disgrace, and is become odious to all Mankind. So formerly, in our *English Dialect* the Word *Knave* denotes a *Servant* or a *Foot-boy*. In the Days of *Henry the Eighth*, in *Tindal's Translation* of the Epistle of *St. Paul* to the *Romans*, we read, *Paul the Apostle, and Knave of Jesus Christ*. Therefore since Words alter their signification in a few Years, we are not to seek for the true sense of Words used in Holy Scripture from *Hesiod*, *Homer*, *Demosthenes*, *Isocrates*, and other *Heathen Authors*, or from *Scapulas* and *Lexicons*, that are their Interpreters, and discover the various Acceptations of Words,

but from the *Holy Scripture*, where, by comparing one Text with another, we may find out the true meaning of the Spirit of God. For that Reason, tho' this Word βαπτίζεν may be sometimes taken in those ancient Authors, and in our Dictionaries, for Dipping; 'tis otherwise understood by the *Ecclesiastical Writers*, and in the *Evangelical*, and *Apostles Writings*, for some thing less; for Washing and Sprinkling where there is no Dipping, as I have already proved.

Now from the Beginning of *Genesis*, to the End of the *Revelations*, and in all the *Apocryphal Books*, I challenge our Adversaries to name one Text, where this Word βαπτίζεν signifies indisputably *Dipping*, without a Possibility of taking it in any other Sense, or is so understood by the Spirit of God; nor do I find it interpreted *Dipping*, by our *English Expositors*, but in the Case of *Naaman the Syrian*, 2 *Kings* 5. 14. in the *Septuagint* is βαπτισατο εν ιορδανη επτακις κατὰ τὸ ῥῆμα Ελισαιε. He baptized himself Seven times in Jordan, according to the Word of *Elisha*; tho' our *English Version* renders it, He dipped; if you look into the former Verses, you shall find this Baptizing in *Jordan* Seven times, expressed by the Verb λέω, I wash, as Vers. 10. Πορευθε λεσαι επτακις εν τῷ ιορδανη, Go and wash Seven times in Jordan. And Verse 12. Are not *Abana and Pharpar, Rivers of Damascus*, better than all the Waters of *Israel*, εχι πορευθε λετομαι εν αυτοις, may I not wash in them and be clean? So Verse 13. his Servants prevailing upon

84 *A Vindication of Infant-Baptism,*

upon him to try the Remedy, that the Prophet had prescribed, uses the same Word *λῶσαι*, wash, for baptize. Now since the Spirit of God in the same place, interprets the Word *ἐβαπτίσατο*, by *Washing*, and our Expositors by *Dipping*; To which Interpretation have we the greatest Reason to incline? For *washing*, expresses something more than *Dipping*, and not the same Act of plunging under Water, namely, the rubbing with the Hand in Water the defiled part. And if we inquire into the *Hebrew* or *Syriack* Word used by Christ in his Commission to his Apostles *To go and baptize all Nations*, we shall find that it signifies to *Sprinkle*, as *Doctor Lightfoot* observes. Christ spoke to them in one of these *Eastern Languages*, the Word is *טבילת* *Tebilah*, from the Root *טבל*, which as *Pagninus* says, is used for *Tingere, Mergere, Lavare vel Baptizare*, for *Dying, Dipping, Washing, or Baptizing*. And *Mr. Leigh* in his *Critical Sacra*, renders it, *Tingendi aut abluendi gratia demersit, ita Lavit, ut res non mundetur, sed tantum attingat humorem, vel tota vel ex parte baptizavit*: He dipped with a purpose to die, or wash; He washed in such a manner, that the Thing was not cleansed but that it might touch the Water, either in Whole or in Part; He Baptized. It seems these are the several Interpretations of the Word *Tabal*, where the Christian Reader may take notice of the Wisdom of our Redeemer, in expressing his Order in such Terms as might

autho-

Pro authorize both Sprinkling and Dipping at
ord baptism, and allow to his Disciples the Li-
Spi berty of using either Custom. Therefore to
the require Dipping as the only lawful Mode at
xpo Baptism, is a great Error, proceeding from
tion a Misunderstanding both of the *Hebrew* and
For *Greek* Words in these Original Tongues, and
Dip of the true Intent and Meaning of Christ.

But I quoted a plainer Text of Holy Scrip-
ture, that calls Sprinkling Baptism, *Heb. 9.*
10. of which *R. M.* tells us, Learned Men
are not agreed how it does accord with
what goes before. I suppose his Learned Men
are his *Blue* and *Leathern-Apron Teachers*, who
cannot endure to hear that Baptism signifies
Sprinkling. But does the Authority of God's
Word depend upon the Agreement of such
Learned Men? Here is an express Text
of Scripture to prove Sprinkling a lawful
Baptism, and that the Apostle understood
this Word for Sprinkling. Yet *R. M.* has
the Confidence to affirm, that these divers
Baptisms mention'd by *St. Paul* out of the
Levitical Law, were divers Dippings as the
Word signifies. If this were true, it had been
an odd kind of Purification, very improper,
and unlikely to be plung'd over Head and
Ears in Blood; besides, *divers Dippings* is
nonsense, for there cannot be different kinds
of Dipping, the Act being always the same.
Now we find Two or Three Expressions
commonly used by *Moses*, *Sprinkling*, *Washing*,
and *Bathing*, the first with Blood, or Water,
the

86 *A Vindication of Infant-Baptism,*

the two latter being Synonymous, express the same Action and Performance, i. e. Washing or Bathing in Water. These are no other are the *Divers Baptisms*, *διαφορετικὰ ἁγισμοὶ* mention'd by the Apostle. The Word *Divers* signifies, different Kinds in the manner and Ingredients: We read indeed of dipping the Priests Finger in Blood and in Water, and dipping the Hyssop and Scarlet Wooll in the Blood of the sacrificed Bird or Beast, to be applied afterwards by Sprinkling to the Persons or Things, that were design'd to be Purified and Cleansed; but in the *Greek* and *Septuagint*, the Verb there always used, is not *baptizein*, but *baptizein* which signifies to dip or plunge. Now don't think R. M. such a Noddy, to interpret the divers Baptisms of St. Paul to be the Dipping of Hyssop, Scarlet Wooll, and the Priest's Fingers in Blood or Water; for 'tis to be understood of the Application of them to the Persons, either by *Bathing* or *Sprinkling*, or to the things that were to be sanctified, the Design of these divers Baptisms being for the Purification from some Uncleaness. And that Method was appointed by God for that purpose, and render'd effectual to answer the End by God's Grace, Power, and Mercy. Now 'tis nonsense to apply it to the Instruments, to the Priest's Finger, or to the Hyssop or Scarlet Wooll, what was intended for the Sanctification of Persons.

Persons or Things: Therefore in all the Mosaic Law, we read of no Dipping or plunging in Water, enjoined for any Purification of Persons or Materials, but only *Sprinkling, Washing, or Bathing*. Now the two latter Words being often expressed by the Verb *לָאָה*, in the *Septuagint*, and signifying the same kind of Baptism, there cannot be Divers Baptisms found in all the *Levitical Law*, unless we take *Sprinkling* for one, in reference, either to the Ingredients, which were either Blood or Water, or to the Baptismal Actions, which were *Sprinkling, Washing, or Bathing*. And 'tis to be noted that *Sprinkling*, which was most times perform'd with Blood, was the most valuable, and always requir'd, when there was a trespass against God. The Law of Purification by *Washing or Bathing* in Water, is set down in *Levit. 15, 16, 17. Chapters*, and in *Numb. Ch. 19. v. 19*. But that of *Sprinkling*, is oftner mention'd, *Exod. 24. 8. Levit. 6. 27. and 8. 11, 30. and Ch. 9. 12, 18. and Numb. 19. 13, 20, 21*. The same kind of Baptism we may find practis'd in the Days of *Hezekiah, 2 Chron. 29. 22*. The Priests received the Blood, and sprinkled it on the Altar, &c. Of this Mode of *Sprinkling*, for the Sanctification of God's People, *St. Paul* speaks, *Hebr. 9. 18, 19*. The first Testament was not dedicated without Blood. For when Moses had spoken every Precept to all the People, according to the Law, he took the Blood of Calves and of Goats,

88 *A Vindication of Infant-Baptism,*

Goats, with Water, and Scarlet Wooll, and Hyssop, and sprinkled both the Book and all the People, &c. Moreover he sprinkled with Blood the Tabernacle and all the Vessels of the Ministry. And almost all things by the Law are purged with Blood, and without the shedding of Blood there is no Remission. The word in the Original *καταρίζεται*, are purged, is an Interpretation of Divers Baptisms, and for what Purpose they were ordained. For as it imports Purifying or Washing, it signifies the Effect and Design of the Sprinklings of Moses's Law, to wash away the Carnal Defilements from the Flesh, and the Spiritual from the Mind, by God's express Command, representing to the Faithful the Blood of a more valuable Sacrifice with which they were to be sprinkled, and their Consciences purged and freed from the Apprehensions of the Divine Justice. Now these Sprinklings are reckon'd amongst the Divers Baptisms of the Ceremonial Law by St. Paul, in the fore-named Text. And as those Mosaick Ordinances were Types and Figures of the Doctrines, Practices and Precepts of the Gospel, and as they were sufficient only by sprinkling of Blood or Water, and such a slender Application to answer the End for which they were appointed, namely Sanctification to the Purifying of the Flesh, how much more efficacious shall the Blood of Christ be, when it is any ways applied unto us in his Ordinance of Baptism, tho' by the Sprinkling and Affusion of Water, to answer

er thereby the gracious Purposes of Divine Wisdom? And are not the frequent *sprinklings* under the Law, a sufficient Vindication of our Practice under the Gospel, of appropriating the Thing signified to the Persons concern'd, namely, the Blood of Christ to the *Sprinkling* or *Affusion* of Water upon the Face, the same Thing having been often signified, and represented to the Faithful *Israelites*, by the same Action, by God's Command, and the Blood of Christ typified by the Blood of the Sacrifices.

My Learned Adversary having nothing more to say upon this Subject, refers us next to Mr. *Stenner's* Answer to Mr. *Russen*; doubtless a more formidable Antagonist, whom he calls to his Assistance. He might have sent us before to this judicious and Learned Author; for he borrows from his Book, much magnified by his Party, all his quotations, and his crude and indigested notions, which we cannot name Reasonings: but what saith that Learned Man for his fond practice of Dipping? No more than what has been formerly written by others for the same Custom. To examine every Paragraph of the Sixth long Chapter, liable to exception, would swell a Volume too big for our Purpose; I shall therefore reduce all his Learning there contained to Five Arguments, with which he labours Tooth and Nail, to establish *Dipping* as the only Mode of true Baptism. And if I answer them with less Learning, and fewer

90 *A Vindication of Infant-Baptism,*

fewer Quotations, it shall be with more Truth and Sincerity on my side.

The first is the Command of our Saviour Christ, and the Primitive Institution, which he gathers from the Meaning he gives to the word βαπτίζειν *to baptize*, which he signifies properly and primarily to dip or immerse in Water.

The Second is the Practice of John Baptist, of Christ and of his Holy Apostles, which he affirms did always baptize by Dipping.

The Third is the Usage of Primitive Antiquity, of the *Greeks* and *Muscovites*, and other Nations, who observ'd, and do yet observe this Mode of Dipping at the Administration of Baptism.

The Fourth is, That the Use and Design of this Holy Institution, being to represent the Death, Burial, and Resurrection of Christ, and a Christian's dying to Sin, and rising to newness of Life, makes this Mode of Administration appear, not only proper, but necessary, *Page 120.*

The Fifth is the Judgment of divers Persons of Figure and Learning, whom I musters up, and who votes for Dipping in Baptism.

To the first I answer, That Mr. *Sternes* is mistaken, when he affirms, that βαπτίζειν signifies only to dip or plunge properly, and wash only by consequence; for I have made it appear this Word signifies in the Administration

tion of Baptism, to sprinkle. We are not
 be altogether govern'd by *Lexicons* and
Opulas in our Judgment of Original Words,
 by the Authors from whom the Compi-
 s of Dictionaries fetch their right significa-
 n; and tho' the Word *baptize* may in the
Greek Authors imply a Dipping or Plunging,
 seeing in the Word of God St. *Paul*
 reckons the Sprinklings of *Moses's* Law a-
 mongst his divers *Baptisms*; and both *Euse-*
bius and *Socrates*, approved *Greek* Authors,
 and many others, esteem the Affusion of
 water a sufficient Baptism, and so under-
 stand the Word, we have no reason to judge
 dipping to be the only approved Mode of
 its Administration; or that Christ com-
 manded it to be always practised in his
 Church, and to prefer the Observance of
 that Rite to the Lives of Men, Infants, and
 the weaker Sex; for whatever some Physi-
 cians may advance to recommend *Cold Baths*,
 and perswade the Dipping in over Head and
 ears to be harmless, 'tis sufficiently known
 that all Constitutions are not alike, and
 that what may be beneficial to some, may be pre-
 judicial to others. I could here bring several
 Tragical Examples of the late pernicious
 Effects of Dipping naked Persons in cold
 water: Mr. *Slate* of *Lyons-Inn*, chill'd his
 blood and hasten'd his Death, by this
 practice, according to the Judgment of two
 the most eminent Physicians Dr. *D* — — &
 Dr. *H* — — s. And my late Friend
 Dr.

Dr. H—mfr—le, became a Cripple by the Use of cold Baths. Doubtless many tender Persons cannot bear the Sharpness of the cold Water in the hottest time of Summer, much less in Winter; and do any think that Infants are able to endure what Persons of Maturity cannot suffer? Such Baptisms agree neither with the Wisdom nor Goodness of God, whose Orders tend to the Preservation of our Lives, as well as the Souls of his Creatures. I cannot but give here a Relation attested to be a Truth by a very good Author, of a certain *Anabaptist Teacher*, who held a Person Dipping so long under Water, after he had cast him upon his Back, that the Person was stifled, and died immediately; whether it was not in his power to rescue him from that Danger, is not said; for the Party being in that helpless Posture, upon his Back, could not so speedily get out before his Breath was gone: But to excuse the Murder among the Zealous Brethren, *You see*, said he, *that Man is no sooner newly born, but God takes him to himself.* I appeal to some, who have been Dipped by those Deceivers, Whether they have not been in hazzard of their Lives by such a Practice? And 'tis not probable that our Wise Saviour, who was to ordain a Sacrament of Initiation into his Church, should use the Use of all Nations, in all Climates, and for all sorts of Tempers and Dispositions of Body, and for all Seasons of the Year, would command the Practice of a Rite, that might

by many of them to their Graves, as soon as they enter'd into his Profession. Therefore in the first Institution he orders his Apostles, *to go and Disciple all Nations by Baptism*; which signifies not only to dip, but to sprinkle, leaving it to the Discretion of the several Churches, to practice that which is most convenient for their People. Our Adversaries are greatly mistaken, when they, in their Confession of Faith, declare, *Immersion in Water necessary to the due Administration of his Ordinance*; as if Christ had annex'd his Blessing, and the Benefits of Baptism to such a Quantity of Water, or to the outward Act and Practice of Dipping. The Application of Water is what is required, and to the Face the most proper Part of the Body to receive this Application. Were Baptism design'd by Christ for the cleansing of the Body, we should then be of our Adversary's Opinion, and vote for the dipping the whole Body in Water; but as the Sacrament is chiefly for the Sanctification of the Mind, and the cleansing the Soul from the Spiritual Pollution of Sin and Iniquity, a lesser Quantity of Water applied to the Persons, may be sufficient to signify and seal us the Benefits there intended by our merciful Saviour, as well as Rivers and the Sea; besides, I would have our Adversaries, who contend so much for Dipping at Baptism, consider, that the Act of Baptizing, is the lawful Ministers Act and Deed by Christ's Appointment.

94 *A Vindication of Infant-Baptism,*
pointment. VWhen therefore he applies
small quantity of Water to the Person, and
pronounces the words commanded by our Lord
and in his name he Baptizes the Person,
needs not communicate nor diffuse the Water
to every part and Member, but only to the
Face, the most proper place, the Window
the Soul, where that inward and spiritual
being is most visible to us, and appears to
the Eye by divers Characters, for whose sake
and benefit Baptism was chiefly ordained.
And 'tis to this sprinkling at Baptism that
St. Peter alludes, *1 Peter 1. 2. Elect according*
to the foreknowledge of God the Father, through
Sanctification of the Spirit, unto obedience and
sprinkling of the Blood of Jesus Christ. Which
means the Apostle by this obedience and
sprinkling of the Blood of Jesus Christ, signifies
that they were made partakers of Christ's
blood by their obedience to his Ordinance
and the sprinkling used at that time, to convey
to them a right to his Blood and Passion
when they engaged themselves in his Religion.
And doubtless the Apostle alludes to
the *Levitical Baptisms* mention'd by St. Paul
of sprinkling the Blood of Beasts and
Birds sacrificed to God: Which were all
Types of the Blood of the Son of God, and
which is by his own Command applied unto
us by the sprinkling of the Baptismal Water
in his Ordinance to sanctify and purge us from
Sin. In the same Language St. Paul speaks to
the same Jews, *Heb. 12. 24. ye are come to*

Mediator of the New Covenant. How were
 to come, but by Baptism the first step
 their coming to Christ? And to the Blood of
 sprinkling, an Hebrew Phrase instead of Blood
 sprinkled. How and where was it sprinkled
 in their Baptism, by the sprinkling of
 water that represents the Blood of Christ,
 whose Blood speaks better things than that of
 Moses; for it not only pleads for, but con-
 fesses the Remission of their Sins, who were
 entered into Covenant with God. This
 use of sprinkling in Baptism is promis'd
 in Ezek. under the Gospel Dispensation,
 6. v. 25. at the return of the Jews into
 their own Land: *Then will I sprinkle clean
 water upon you, and ye shall be clean, &c.
 A new Heart will I give you, and a new Spirit
 I will put within you, and I will take away the
 stony Heart out of your Flesh, and I will give
 you a Heart of Flesh, and I will put my
 Spirit within you, and cause you to walk in
 my Statutes, and ye shall keep my Judgments and
 obey them.* Here is the Birth of Water or
 Baptism express'd by sprinkling, and the
 Birth of the Spirit which God promised to
 the Jews in the latter days; therefore let
 their Adversaries desist from alledging the
 Command and Institution of Christ for Dip-
 ping, for their suppositions are false, ill-
 founded and erroneous, and not agreeing
 with the mind of Christ, nor the Current of
 Holy Scripture, nor the right interpretation
 of the Word *καταλίζω* in this case.

Mr.

96 *A Vindication of Infant-Baptism,*

Mr. Stennet's second Argument for Dipping in which he seems to Triumph over *Russen*, is drawn from the Circumstances the Administrations of this Ordinance, *John the Baptist*, by our Saviour and his ly Apostles Recorded in the Holy Scriptures which he says, does abundantly confirm Dipping in Baptism. The Circumstances he fantasies makes for his purpose, are plenty of Water where *John Baptist* Baptized, then going into the River *Jordan* and other Brooks. Their coming out again it is expressly said of Christ, *Matth. 3* and the *Eunuch*, *Acts 8*. What do all the Texts make for Dipping? Indeed it is that our Saviour was Baptized by *John*, and the *Eunuch* by *Philip*; but unless the word always signify to plunge or dip, which it does not, I understand not how Mr. Stennet, with his Wit and Learning, can conclude, that either of them were dipped over Head and Ears, as he would perswade us, and to his own Terms; Does he think the Fictions of his Brain are good proof in a matter of this Consequence, that is so prejudicial to the Honour and Religion of the Reformed Churches? And that his supposed probability will satisfy the Judgment of any rational Man, or the Conscience of any serious Christian? Could not Christ and the *Eunuch* be dipped into the Water to be Baptized without being Dipped? 'Tis not said they went under but into the Water. Our Adversaries, who require

require plain Scripture for our Belief and
 Practices, ought to give us the same Scripture
 for their erroneous Principles and Customs,
 they would have us receive them. And
 for the Plenty of Water where *John* was Bap-
 tizing, he chose those places, because there
 was Water at all Times and Seasons of the
 Year, in that dry Country or Wilderness, for
 the conveniency of such as came to him to be
 baptized; but to argue from the plenty of
 Water in *Jordan*, that the Multitude were
 dipped over Head and Ears in it, I see no
 reason to believe it, unless Mr. *Stennet* could
 produce some other proof, than the word
 baptize, which as I have proved, signifies
 the application of Water by sprinkling,
 without dipping or plunging. This agrees
 with the description that Travellers give of
 the River *Anon*, which is but a Rivulet that
 a Man may stride over, commonly not so
 large, and scarce as deep as the least Streams
 of Water that run through the Streets of
Salisbury, to which Mr. *B.* in the 12th Chapter
 of *Infant Church Membership* agrees. 'Tis not
 probable, and perhaps not possible to be dipped
 or plunged in that shallow Stream. And for
 the *Eunuch*, 'tis not likely that, being up-
 on his Journey towards his Country, he
 was dipped in Baptism; for besides the Cir-
 cumstance of his Travelling, that Region
 between *Jerusalem* and *Egypt* is dry, hilly,
 and sandy, having nothing but small Riva-
 lets, which in the Summer, for the most part,

E

are

98 *A Vindication of Infant-Baptism,*

are drier up. If we may believe *Fuller* Miscel. p. 205. He was Baptized at a Spring which arises at the Foot of a Mountain near *Bethsoron* and *Boteshellah*, where 'twas impossible for him to be dipped; but if he were dipped, he was either Naked or with his Garments on; if the latter, 'twas to be termed a steeping or soaking of his Body in Water, and the dipping of his Cloath rather than a dipping of his Person: If he was required to be Naked, 'twas an act of immodesty, that might have discourag'd him from such a Profession, that reduces Men and Women to lose all sense of Shame, and Rule of Chastity and Decency. And if we may give Credit to the ancient Pictures of the Baptism of Christ and of his Holy Apostles we shall find them standing upright, and not Baptized and Baptizing, and not Dipping or Dipped under Water. He brings a Text of *Acts* 22. 16. where *Ananias* speaks to *Saul* newly converted; *And now why tarriest thou arise and be Baptized, and wash away thy Sins* Which Mr. *Stennet* would have interpreted Be dipped and wash away thy Sins; And will not Be sprinkled and wash away thy Sins. For 'tis not the quantity of Water, nor the Action of Dipping that hath so great an influence upon the Mercy of our God, or the Consciences of Men, to wash away Sins; but the Divine Blessing that can Operate with few Drops as well, and as efficaciously, as with the Waters of a whole River. Truly if we

Exam

examine the mode of Dipping practis'd by some of the Anabaptists; we shall find it very scandalous, contrary to all Civility, Modesty and good Manners, and very ridiculous. The Dipper leads the Party into the Water half Naked, others have a thin Garment to cover them; the Dipper takes the Party by both Hands, and lays him or her upon the Back, flat in the Water over Head and Ears, and then pulls the Party out again. Others take the Person to be dipped by the Collar, and dounce or plunge their Heads under Water. Others have dipped the Parties Naked. For all the Anabaptists, who insist so much for dipping at Baptism, are not agreed about the true and ancient mode; but vary very much in their Practices. What Franks and Acts of Uncleanness the Dippers are guilty of with some of the Female Sex, after they have been plung'd by them, divers have witnessed; but with what certainty I cannot tell. Besides many inconveniences and scandals may happen by such a Naked Dipping. See Mr. Baxter, c. 13.

The Third Argument Mr. Stennet produces for his beloved practice of Dipping, is the usage of the Primitive Antiquity of the Greeks and Muscovites, and other Nations, who observed, and do yet observe this mode of dipping at the Administration of Baptism. I may without offence here make use of Mr. Stennet's words, *Their practice is no rule to us unless we could be sure these Nations*

100 *A Vindication of Infant-Baptism,*
were infallible ; we shall not be secure in following
their steps any farther, than they follow'd those of
Christ and his Apostles : And tho' their com-
mon practice was, and is to dip, unless Mr. *Sten-*
net can prove, that they never make use of affu-
sion, sprinkling, or any other mode but dipping
at Baptism, and that they judge that Circum-
stance such an essential part of that Ordinance,
that it is invalid without it, he has proved no-
thing to any purpose ; for our Church pre-
scribes dipping as a Primitive custome ; but it
cannot conceive it to be so necessary, but that
Baptism may be Administred without it, and
with a lesser application of Water, as we
have proved by Holy Scripture and *Greek*
Authors. And as it cannot be made plain
to us from the Word of God, that dipping
under Water was either the Command of
Christ, or the Practice of him and of his
Commissioned *Apostles*, We have great rea-
son to imagine, that this mode of Baptism
may be derived to the Gentiles, and taken up
by them from the superstitious washings and
bathings of the *Jews*, who may have enter-
tain'd the thought, that the Baptized Person
was not perfectly clean and fit to enter in-
to Covenant with God, unless the whole
Body was purified with Water. This Con-
jecture is not without some probability
and proof from *Jewish* Authors ; for their
Rabbies inform us, That the Male Gentiles
were Profelyted to their Faith by Circumci-
sion, Baptism, and a Sacrifice ; and the Wo-

men and their Female Children, by Baptism and a Sacrifice. They were so Superstitious in their Baptism, that if but the tip of their Finger or Toe was not wash'd with Water, they could not be reckon'd as Profelytes. So says *Maimonides*, and other Authors confirm the same. What a strange nicety was this to make the reality of Conversion, and consequently of Salvation, depend upon such a Punctilio? As if God regarded so much a total immersion of the Body, as to exclude them from a right to his favour, for the neglect of a drop of Water in a practice of Humane Institution. The *Jews* were fond of their Superstitious Rites in the Days of Christ, for which he reprov'd them, because they prefer'd the observation of them to the Sacred Laws of God. From this vain Opinion, that a Person could not be a Profelyte without a total immersion, and washed all over, is derived this Superstitious Practice of our Anabaptists, first taken up by some Primitive Converts to Christianity; for we know how busie and earnest the *Jewish* People were to impose upon the Gentiles their abrogated Rites and Customs, and we find some taken up by them; therefore reprov'd by *St. Paul*. The *Galatians* would needs be Circumcised after the manner of the *Israelites*, and we find many thought themselves oblig'd to observe the *Jewish* Sabbath. Not to mention the *Ebionites* who imitated the *Esseans*, the *Gnostics* and *Montanists*, who follow'd the steps of

102 *A Vindication of Infant-Baptism,*
other *Jewish* Sects, the *Cathari* and *Novatian*
Puritans, who were infected with the Lea-
ven of the *Pharisees* ; the *Hemerobaptists*, who,
like the *Jews*, washed themselves every Day;
there was no Error nor Extravagancy amongst
them, but we may find it embrac'd by the
Heretick Gentiles and others, out of a fond
esteem of the *Jewish* Rites and Customs. 'Tis
not unlikely that the immersion at Baptism
may be derived and practised, and fanstied as
a necessary circumstance by some Primitive
Nations from the same Original ; but we have
so imperfect an account from the first two
Centuries after Christ, of this and other mat-
ters, through the loss of Authors, and scarci-
ty of Writers of those times, that we can
only guess at the truth of Christians pro-
ceedings in divers cases ; and 'tis very unjust
and unreasonable in our Adversaries, upon
so slender, imperfect, and uncertain relations
of the Primitive Practice of the Churches of
Christ in this case, to condemn all the Or-
thodox and Reformed Churches as irregular,
and deny them their Christianity as our
Adversaries do, for varying from them as
they suppose in so light a Circumstance as
this. They consider not, that by pleading for
a total Immersion of the Body at Baptism,
they contend to keep up amongst us Christi-
ans the *Jewish* insignificant Superstitions and
Immersions, from whence this Primitive
Practice seems to be derived. But our Church
cannot be charg'd with the countenancing of
this

this Superstition, because it allows of both Modes of Sprinkling and Dipping as sufficient and indifferent ; and because 'tis loth to vary from any Primitive Practice, therefore 'tis left to the Parents and Ministers choice and prudence. However, tho' we acknowledge divers of the first Christian Churches to have used Dipping or Baptism, if we may believe Authors, we find not any to have laid such necessity upon the fashion, as to forbear Sprinkling on certain occasions, or to think it appertains to the essential part of that Ordinance ; for we read of *Laurentius* and *Lucillus*, two Martyrs, Baptized in Prison by sprinkling. Neither are the Eastern Churches to prescribe to us a Rule and Pattern in this Case : Their hot Country admitted such Practice without Prejudice to their Health ; but ours being much colder, 'tis not reasonable to impose upon our People such a Custom, which may hasten many tender bodies to their Graves, chiefly in the frozen season of Winter, whatever Sir *John Floyer*, or other Advocates for cold Bathing may pretend, to encourage their Pernicious and dangerous Practice, which is contradicted and opposed by divers, as experienced Physicians.

What Mr. *Stennet* saith as to the *Greek* Church, it was its ancient custom, both to sprinkle and Dip at Baptism. The first may be proved from the Action of the *Jew*, who lay'd his Head over the Font to be Baptized ;

and 'tis observable that there was a Font in the Novatian Church like to ours ; for it had a hole in the bottom where the Water was let out, as *Socrates* takes notice. If we may conclude from thence the constant practice of Baptizing the Catechumen and Adult Persons in the Face of the Congregation, there were none dipped there, but received their Baptism by an Affusion or Sprinkling of Water. As to the *Muscovites*, we have no certain account of their Practice in Relation to Infants, whether they be Dipped or Sprinkled, neither can so erroneous a Church reasonably pretend to give Laws to the rest of Christians: But the Churches of *Sweden* and *Denmark*, all the Churches of *Germany*, *Bohemia*, *Silesia*, *Moravia*, &c. all the Churches of *France*, the *Netherlands*, *Italy* and *Spain*, both Protestants and Papists, Baptize by affusion of Water, and Judge dipping to be no material Circumstance of this Ordinance ; for the *Abyssin* Churches under the Grand Negus in *Africa*, he is mistaken, to tell us that their Patriarch belongs to the Church of *Alexandria*. *Damianus a Goes* saith the contrary ; for when their *Abuna* is Dead, another is elected by the *Abyssin* Monks of *Jerusalem* ; who passing with the Emperor's Embassador thro' *Egypt*, calls upon the Patriarch of *Alexandria* at *Grand Cairo*, and only shews him his Commission, as a Brother would do, but receives no Authority from him, neither is it probable, the one being under the *Turk*

should

should Command over a Patriarch of another Nation, who hath Seventeen large Kingdoms under his Jurisdiction. This is the account that *Zaga Zabo* mention'd by *Damianus a Goes* and others give. These *African* Christians, as *Mr. Ruffen* very well observes, retain since the Apostles time the Baptism of Infants, and their Sprinkling in the Administration, tho' in a very hot Country. And 'tis to be observed, that they derived not these Customs from the Church of *Rome*, with which they never had any Communication but in these latter Days. They are Surrounded by *Mahometans* and *Infidels*, Enemies of the Christian name: And that they have been very tenacious of their old Rites and Usages in Religion to a degree of Superstition, and therefore 'tis not probable that they have receiv'd any new Impressions or Prescriptions from other Nations or Churches. And tho' they are not infallible Christians, as *Mr. Stennet* tells us, their Ancient Custom of Sprinkling at Baptism derived to them from their forefathers, is sufficient to justify this mode from *Mr. Stennet's* accusation of Novelty, or that it was not known or practised in the Primitive Times.

His Fourth Argument, to prove Dipping necessary at Baptism is, *That the Use and Design of this Holy Institution, being to represent the Death, Burial, and Resurrection of Christ, and Christians dying to Sin, and rising to newness of Life,*

106 *A Vindication of Infant-Baptism,*
Life, makethis a Mode of Administration appear
not only proper, but necessary. Mr. Stennet con-
founds the Use that we are to make of this
Ordinance, with the Design of Christ in the
Institution, and makes it a Typick Repre-
sentation of the Death of Christ, of his
Burial, &c. to establish the Necessity of
Dipping : Whereas the Principal Intent and
Design of it is, its being a Sign and Seal of
our Entrance into Covenant with God, of
the Remission of our Sins, and of the ac-
knowledgment of God for our Sovereign
Lord. For which purpose there is no need
of any such Mimick Representation of Christ's
Death, Burial, and Resurrection, &c. by
being buried under Water. We may as
well require the Baptized to remain there
Three Days and Three Nights, to make the
Representation a more perfect Figure, or to
continue under that Element till they be
Dead, as Christ was, that they might better
shew forth and shadow their Saviour breath-
less in the Grave, which would be ridiculous
to imagine, and pernicious to the Lives of
Men. Yet Mr. Stennet hath so great an
esteem for this Argument, that he repeats it
Three or Four times in this Chapter ; and
tells us, *If the Ordinance of Christ receives its*
virtue from the Law of Christ, then it must be
perform'd according to that Law, if we would
receive a Blessing in it. His reasoning depends
upon a Supposition, which we have proved
to be false, That Christ's Law hath ordain-

ed only Dipping in Baptism, whereas the Word signifies to Sprinkle, in Holy Scripture, oftner and more frequently than to dip or wash, as I have made it appear: Neither can we gather any certain Conclusion from the Baptism of Christ, or of any of his Disciples or Apostles, that they were plunged all over in Water. They went into the Water, not under it; this Expression signifies no more but that they enter'd in perhaps Knee deep and came out again upon the dry Land. To conclude from hence Dipping, Men must have a strange Imagination, and a strong Fancy, capable of the most improbable and absurd Notions. For this purpose he cites the counterfeit Epistle of *Barnabas*, the Vision of *Hermas*, a Passage out of *Tertullian*, and another out of *Gregory Nazianzen*, all which say little more, but at Baptism Men enter'd into the Water. He quotes next, *Chrysostome* and *Ambrose*, who prove the Mode of Dipping to be then in use; but both those Fathers approved and practiced Sprinkling, or Affusion of Water in divers Cases, as may be proved from their Writings: Therefore they thought not Dipping to be so necessary in Baptism, as to esteem the Sacrament null and void without it, as our Adversaries imagine, and publicly declare in their Catechism and Confession of Faith.

But Mr. *Stennet* thinks the Allusions of *St. Paul*, *Rom. 6. Col. 2. Phil. 3.* do require a Dipping under Water at Baptism. He must

108 *A Vindication of Infant-Baptism,*

must give me leave to correct this Mistake, from whence he concludes the Necessity of Plunging under VVater. In the sixth of the *Romans*, the Apostle argues against those who charg'd him with the Encouragement of Sin, that the Grace and Mercy of God might more abound in the Pardon. This Error he disclaims, saying, *How shall we that are dead to Sin, live any longer therein?* He speaks here of such as are truly regenerate, that they were dead and senseless to Sin, took no delight in it, had an Aversion for it; and therefore could not live in the Practice and Pleasure of Sin. He appeals next to their Knowledge, that when they were enter'd into their Holy Profession by Baptism, *they were Baptized into the Death of Christ*; that is, made Partakers of his Death and Passion, by the Benefits then confer'd upon them by the Holy Spirit, and therefore were *buried with him by Baptism into Death*, that is, the Death of Sin, which they had renounced. *That like as Christ was raised up from the Dead by the Glory of the Father, so we also should walk in newness of Life*; for if we have been planted together in the Likeness of his Death, we shall be also in the Likeness of his Resurrection, &c. All this to the 13th Verse is to be understood in a Spiritual Sense, for the inward Renovation of the Mind begun and encouraged in us at Baptism, by the Operation of the Spirit of God; for such only can be said to be dead unto Sin, to be baptized into Christ's Death,

to walk in newness of Life, whose old Man
 Crucified with Christ, that the Body of
 Sin might be destroy'd. Such only can
 reckon themselves to be dead indeed un-
 to Sin, but alive unto God through Jesus
 Christ, that Sin might not reign in their
 mortal Body, that they should obey it in the
 Lusts thereof, &c. 'Tis possible for the Wit
 of Man to stretch out a Comparison, and to
 fancy an Allusion, where there is none in-
 tended, and to deal with God's Word as
 some do with the Clouds, who imagine they
 see there the Appearances of Men, Beasts,
 and creeping things, when in reality there
 are no such visible Shapes. Mr. Stennet is
 not the first who hath interpreted St. Paul
 as he does, many Learned and Orthodox
 Christians have understood him according to
 this meaning; but as the Word cannot be
 taken in a Literal Sense, for the outward
 Administration of Baptism by Dipping,
 but for the inward Efficacy and Fruits of this
 Ordinance, for the inward Operation and Re-
 generation of the Mind, or for the blessed Con-
 sequences and Fruits of Christ's Proceedings in
 our Redemption, I cannot understand how this
 can be applied to be buried under Water, and
 to issue out of it again, as an Image and Repre-
 sentation of the Death, Burial, and Resur-
 rection of Christ. Is such a Burial under Water
 more efficacious than Sprinkling? 'Tis likewise
 to be consider'd that this outward Practice of
 Dipping under Water, cannot intitle the
 Baptized

110 *A Vindication of Infant-Baptism,*

Baptized to the Death, Burying, and Resurrection of Christ, without an inward Application of the Spirit of God and his Blessings. And how many are amongst our Adversaries thus buried under Water, as they understand it with Christ, by being dipped at their Baptism, yet live in Sin, and are scandalous in their Lives afterwards? In like manner is to be understood, *Colos. 2. 12.* *Buried with him in Baptism.* The Apostle expounds this Burying, which is not under Water, neither can such be said to be buried with Christ, who are plunged without him out of his Presence and Society, in a Literal Sense; but *St. Paul* discovers the Meaning of this Burying in the former and succeeding Verses, where he says, *In whom also ye are circumcised with the Circumcision made without Hands; That is, by the Circumcision of the Spirit of God.* Therefore 'tis made without Hands, in putting off the Body of the Sins of the Flesh, by the Circumcision of Christ, and the Reformation and Sanctification of the Holy Ghost. *Buried with him in Baptism, wherein ye are also risen with him,* how, and in what manner are these things asserted, the Apostle tells you, *Through the Faith of the Operation of God, who hath raised him from the Dead, &c.* That is, the same Omnipotency that was visibly acting in the raising of Christ from the Dead, hath also quickned you, when you were dead in Sins, to a newness of Life through your Faith and Obedience; and no

by representing the Death, Burial, and Resurrection of Christ, in a Mimick Observation of dipping under Water in Baptism, as Christ was under Ground; but by a real Death unto Sin, and a New Reformation of Life, by the Agency of the Holy Spirit in your Minds. In the other Text, *Phil. 3. 10.* there 'tis the Apostle desires, *That he may know Christ, and the Power of his Resurrection, and the Fellowship of his Sufferings, being made conformable unto his Death.* How and in what manner is this Conformity to be understood? Is it to be buried a Minute or Two under Water? What will this Fantastical Conformity avail, or benefit the Bodies or the Souls of Men? 'Tis a Spiritual Conformity to the Death of Christ, by being Dead unto Sin, and Living unto Righteousness, that is here understood: The drift of the Apostle, and the Context point at, and plainly express this Meaning of the Words. Now this is procured to the Faithful Souls, and to all sincere Believers at our manner of Administration of Baptism, as well as at the Dipping over Head and Ears: For by Faith in the Promises of God, and the Operation of the Holy Spirit in our Minds, we obtain all these Advantages; we are baptized into the Death of Christ; we are buried with him into Death; we are raised to walk in Newness of Life; our old Man is crucified with him; we are dead unto Sin, and we are alive unto God; we are in Covenant with God, and have obtained from him the

the forgiveness of our Sins, &c. And all this is sealed and confirmed unto us in our Baptism, as well by an Affusion of a little Water, as by whole Floods and Rivers; our Persons being all Baptized, according to Christ's Appointment, by the Application of Water, and the Minister's Words, according to God's Promise, *Ezek. 36. 26.* which *Rabbi Sol.* mention'd by Mr. *Lightfoot* in his *Hor. Hebr.* Page 57: expounds, *Expiabo vos atque amovebo immunditiam vestram per asper- sionem aqua Purificationis*: I will make an Expiation for you, and remove away your Uncleaness, by the Asperision or Sprinkling of the Water of Purification, which under the Gospel is to be understood of the Baptism of Water and the Spirit. And conformable to this Doctrine is St. Paul's Expression *1 Cor. 12. 13.* *For by one Spirit we are all Baptized into one Body.* He means Christ's Mystical Body, his Church, which is effected at our Baptism, that requires not Dipping but an Affusion of Water or Sprinkling. So likewise we are to understand the same Apostle, *1 Cor. 15. 29.* *What shall they do which are baptized for the Dead, if the Dead rise not at all?* Why are they then baptized for the Dead? He alludes to the Ancient Custom of some Churches, where such as were to be baptized came to the Sepulchre of the deceased, and there *ὕψις τῶν νεκρῶν* poured over the Bones, or Bodies, or Tombs of the deceased Martyrs, they received their Baptism.

ism, to encourage them to contend for the Crown of Martyrdom, in imitation of those former Worthies, and to declare their Resolution to die for Christ, and that they believed the Resurrection of the Dead. Now this Custom could not well be perform'd by Dipping, but by Sprinkling; for the Bodies, Bones, and Tombs of the Dead, were not floating in Water, over which these People were baptized. However, all other Interpretations that are given to this Text cannot consist with the Mode of Dipping, but necessarily suppose Sprinkling, or such a lesser Ablution of Water, as I could make it appear, by examining the other several Expositions. Now the Words of the Learned *Causab.* deserve to be recorded, on *Matth. 2. 6.* Some, saith he, have contended for the whole Body to be dipped in the Ceremony of Baptism, for they alledge the Signification of the Word *καταβα*: But this Opinion hath been already rejected, *Quam non in eo posita est mysterii hujus vis & iresyma.* For the Efficacy and Energy of this Sacrament does not consist in that Action.

The Fifth and Last Effort that Mr. Stennet makes in this Chapter, to advance and obtain Credit to the Dipping Mode at Baptism, he musters up a small Army of Learned Men, of all sorts and sizes, who vote for this Custom, and declare that it was the primitive Practice; *Grotius* leads the Van, *Beckerman*, *Daille*, *Morus*, *Philippus a Limborch*,

114 *A Vindication of Infant-Baptism,*
bach, the Assembly of Divines, *Joseph Mede,*
Bishop *Taylor,* *Thomas Aquinas,* *Dominicus a*
Soto, Dr. *Barrow,* Bishop *Burnet,* Dr. *Fow-*
ler, Dr. *Cave,* Dr. *Allen,* Dr. *Towerson,*
Dr. *Whitby,* Sir *Norton Knatchbull,* Dr. *Ed-*
wards, and a Number more. All these Per-
sons of several Opinions and Churches,
were baptized in their Infancy, accord-
ing to the Usage of the Congregations
unto which they belong, and by Asperision or
Affusion of Water: And all of them have
since approved of, and practiced this Custom,
and judg'd it sufficient to answer the Com-
mand of Christ and his Institution. What
signifies Mr. *Stennet's* alledging their Testi-
monies, to witness the Primitive Practice,
while by Word and Deed they declare that
Dipping is a Circumstance not belonging to
the Substance or Essential Part of Baptism?
That Sprinkling or Immersion seem in rea-
lity to have the same Effect, and both
Modes are esteem'd sufficient, see Mr. *Sten-*
net, Page 177. I cannot pass over one Testi-
mony more without a Correction; where 'tis
said, *They led them into the Water, and with*
no other Garments but what might cover Nature;
they at first laid them down in the Water, as a
Man is laid in his Grave, and then said those
Words, I Baptize thee, &c. This laying down in
Water, I am perswaded cannot be proved
from any Authentick and Ancient Authors;
and with respect to the Character of the
Person be it spoken, it was never practised

by any, but by our Superstitious Anabaptists. And if this was written to gratify them, 'tis inexcusable in a Person of that Wisdom, Abilities, and Function, and deserves a severe Censure. He quotes next a long dispute between the Bishop of *Meaux* and Mr. *De la Roque*; but to what Purpose I know not, unless it be to declare to the World his Skill in the *French* Tongue; for both the Bishop and the Minister's Practice contradicts their Persuasion, if they judg'd Dipping to be of an absolute necessity in Baptism: For in the *French* Churches, and in the *Roman*, 'tis very well known, that no other Mode is allowed and in usage, but that of Sprinkling, or pouring Water on the Face. If Mr. *De la Roque* calls Aspersions an Abuse, and saith, that his Church hath derived this Practice from the Church of Rome, without a due Examination, as many other things which it still retains, renders their Baptism very defective. It shews him to be a Man of neither Discretion, Prudence, Judgment or sound Learning, to contradict in these Expressions the Practice and Persuasion of all the Orthodox Divines of his Communion, and to give such an Advantage to the Enemies of our Christian Religion, Faith, and Pious Customs. We must say as Mr. *Stennet* saith of others, we have no reason to be of his Judgment, unless he could prove him to be infallible.

Mr. *Stennet* concludes his Learned Chapter with a Lamentation, That so many Pious and Learned

116 *A Vindication of Infant-Baptism,*

Learned Men should find themselves so fetter'd by the Tyranny of Custom and Tradition, &c. And we have cause to take up the same Lamentation for him and his Sect, That so many should be possess'd with such strong Prejudices and Aversion against the express Ordinance of Christ, and the Primitive and General Pattern now in use in the Churches of Christ, a Pattern whatever some may pretend, founded in the Word of God, and grounded upon Reason, as to walk retrograde to so many as bear the Christian Name. What shall we conclude from this laborious and learned Performance, and from so many Authors that he brings to prove the Practice of Dipping, while they all allow also of Sprinkling to be sufficient, but the old Proverb is verified here, *Parvum turriunt Montes nascetur ridiculus Mus.*

But I have pursued Mr. Stennet so far, that I have almost forgot my old Antagonist, my Learned School-master R. M. who tells me that the late Archbishop of York, in a Sermon before Queen Mary, commends Dipping in Baptism as a Primitive Practice March 27. 1692. I am confident R. M. is guilty of a blunder here, for the late Archbishop of York, Dr. Lamplough was dead long before; but I fancy he means the late Archbishop of Canterbury of blessed Memory To whose Judgment and Writings I dare appeal both for Infant-Baptism, and the sufficiency of Sprinkling in the Ordinance of Baptism. R. M. pretends to answer what

Passage

Passages I quote for Infant-Baptism from
 Antiquity: First this Text of *Justin Martyr*,
That several Persons among us, of Sixty or Seven-
ty Years old, of both Sexes, who were discipled to
Christ in their Childhood, continue uncorrupted,
Apol. 1. vulgo 2a. The Design of this and
 other Quotations of those early days of
 Christianity, is to discover to our People,
 and our Adversaries, that from the first esta-
 blishment of our Religion, the Baptism of
 Infants was in use, and that approved Au-
 thors mention it within the Two Hundred
 Years after Christ, in a Time that they could
 not be ignorant of the blessed Rules left to
 us by Christ and his Holy Apostles, for
 us to observe. But *R. M.* tells me, *That*
we have miserably mistaken the Sense of the
Author. Wherein? Because, saith he, *Justin*
speaks there of Adultery and Fornication. If he
 had discours'd of Theft, Slander, or any
 other Sin, 'twas not contrary to my Pur-
 pose: I alledge him, only to shew how Dis-
 ciples were made in the Primitive Christia-
 nity, in their Childhood, and that by Bap-
 tism, *ἐκ παιδων ἐμαρτυρέοντων τῷ Χριστῷ*, from
 their Childhood were discipled to Christ. That
 they were enter'd into our Saviour's
 school, and into Covenant with God by his
 Ordinance of Initiation. Now *Justin Martyr*
 wrote his Apology to *Antoninus Pius*, the
 adopted Son of *Adrian*, about the Year of our
 Lord 150, about 50 Years after the Death of
 St. John at *Ephesus*. This Zealous Defender
 of

118 *A Vindication of Infant-Baptism,*

of the Christian Faith, living within so short a time after the Apostle, saith, *That some 60 or 70 years of Age were Discipled to Christ or Baptized in their Childhood, or from that time were dedicated to him; this is a plain evidence, that within the Days of St. John the Baptism of Infants was the undoubted practise of the Christian Church.* What R. M. says to elude this Testimony is insignificant and impertinent. The next I quote is *Irenaeus* his Book against Heresies, where l. 2. c. 39. after he had from the Evangelists proved that Christ continued in his Ministry Three years, tells us, *Omnem enim venit per semet ipsum salvare, omnes inquam qui per eum renascuntur in Deum infantes, & parentes, & pueros, & juvenes, & seniores &c.* For he came to save all Persons by himself, all I mean who by him are regenerated unto God, Infants and little ones, and Children, and Youths, and Elder Persons. Now Infants being reckoned amongst those, who by Christ are regenerated to God, we are to understand in the Author's sense, that they, as well as the rest, were Baptized by Christ's Command.

So *Irenaeus* understands the word Regenerated, l. 3. c. 19. *When he gave his Disciples the Commission of Regenerating unto God, he said unto them, Go and Teach all Nations Baptizing them, &c.* where by the Commission of Regenerating, he means Christ's Commission of Baptizing. How vainly and impertinently

pertinently does *R. M.* answer this Quotation. *I profess, Men saith he seem to be driven to hard shifts, to support a Cause, when they are forced to bring such places as these ; for all that he can pretend to from hence, is, that the word Regenerate is by the Fathers used sometimes to signify Baptism, therefore it is so to be understood here.* Shall we understand the Author according to his own exposition, or as *R. M.* would have us, for the inward work of Regeneration ? *Irenæus* in the forementioned place, and in divers others, as well as the other Fathers, take Regeneration for Baptism, and so 'tis interpreted in the Annotation, *by the Name of Regeneration, which is our Lords, and an Apostolick Phrase, Irenæus understands Baptism, by which he plainly confirms the Apostolick Tradition of the Baptism of little Infants against the Impiety of the Anabaptists.* When *Irenæus* mentions Infants to be regenerated, 'tis intelligible enough, that they are not capable of Regeneration, as far as we understand in any other sense of the word, than as it signifies Baptism, that is the outward administration of Baptism, by which they are enter'd into Covenant with God, and into his Churches Communion. But this unadvised Answerer saith, That *Irenæus* knew nothing of making Infants Disciples by Baptism without Teaching, because he saith, *How had Christ Disciples, if he did not teach ?* I have already given a reply to *R. M.* that the Author there speaks
not

120 *A Vindication of Infant-Baptism,*

not of Infants, but argues against those, who said, *Illi dicunt uno Anno Christum predicasse, & duodecimo mense passum, &c.* They say that Christ fulfill'd his Ministry in one year, and the Twelfth Month was put to Death, &c. Such saith he, pass over the chief part of his business, and the most necessary and most honourable part of his Age, that part in which by teaching he commanded all Persons. *For how had he Disciples if he did not Teach, and how did he teach, if he had not attained to the Age of a Master; for he came not to Baptism till he was Thirty years of Age?* He speaks of Christ's instructing his Disciples and the Multitude, and it is evident, he could have none of them to be his Disciples without teaching. What is this to Infants? *R. M.* is like those mishapen Beasts, that when they come to drink out of a clear Water, and see their ugly Physiognomy and Shape trouble the Water by stirring up the Mud, that they might no longer behold what they are vexed to see. Thus my Antagonist confounds and disturbs the clearest Quotations for Infant Baptism out of Antiquity, with Ironical expressions, and false and improper applications which belong not to them, that he might not discover there his impiety and pernicious Error. For *Origen* and *Cyprian* he fancies he hath me at an advantage, because there is a mistake in the Chronology: I must here rectify the Printers Error, and that of my Antagonist in both. *Origene* when

his Father *Leonides* suffer'd Martyrdom, by being Beheaded at *Alexandria*, which was in the Tenth year of *Severus*, about *A. D.* 202. was then Seventeen years old, as *Ensebius* tells us, so that he was born about the year 185, Eighty four years after the Death of *St. John* at *Ephesus*, who lived till the Reign of *Trajan*, about *A. D.* 101. There may be two years difference in the reckoning. This *Origen* was a Learned Man, esteem'd by all sorts of People, and a zealous Christian, publickly known, and his Writings read all over the Eastern parts; so that his Testimony concerning Infant Baptism, is not of a single Person; as Bishop *Taylor* saith, but of all the Age wherein he lived; for what he affirms was never contradicted by any of that Time, but approved of, and applauded as an undoubted truth: And 'tis to be consider'd, that he living within Eighty Two, or Eighty Four years after the Death of the Apostle *St. John*, and being Born of Christian Parents, and Baptized in his Infancy within 200 years of the Birth of Christ, could not be ignorant of the practice of the Apostles, and of the customs of Christians in a matter of that concern as Baptism, the Seal of the Gospel Covenant. Now let us hear, and I desire *R. M.* to understand, how expressly he speaks for Infant Baptism, as the constant usage of Christians in his and the former Ages. In his Eighth *Hom.* on *Lev.* 12. after he had acknowledged with *David*, the original Sin and Guilt, with which all Mankind is naturally Polluted, he saith, *What is there, son, that whereas the*

122 *A Vindication of Infant-Baptism,*

Baptism of the Church is given 'em for forgiveness of Sins, Infants also are by the usage of the Church Baptized? When if there were nothing in Infants that wanted forgiveness and Mercy, the Grace of Baptism would be needless to them. And in a Homil. on Luke 14, he saith, Having occasion given by this place, I will mention a thing that causes frequent enquiries among the Brethren, Infants are Baptized for the forgiveness of Sins: Of what Sins? Or when have they Sinned? Or how can any reason of the washing of Infants in their Case hold good, but according to that sense that we mention'd before. None is free from Pollution, tho' his Life continue but one day upon Earth; and 'tis for that reason, because by the Sacrament of Baptism the Pollution of our Birth is taken away, that Infants are Baptized. Likewise on the 6th Chapter of the Epistle to the Romans, l. 5. He declares, because of Original Sin, That the Church had from the Apostles a Tradition to give Baptism even to Infants. For they to whom the Divine Mysteries were committed knew that there is in all Persons the natural Pollution of Sin, which must be done away by Water and the Spirit. The Works of Origen were Translated by St. Jerom and Rufinus, Men of Orthodox Principles, and therefore very well attested: And 'tis not probable that both would agree to deliver to the World a false Interpretation in this case. He was of a Family that had professed the Christian Faith many years. Eusebius tells us, His Forefathers had been Christians for several Generations.

Generations. And *Rufinus* saith, That the Christian Doctrine had been conveyed to him, ab avis atque atavis, from his Grandfather and great Grandfather. Besides he had Travell'd into Syria, Cappadocia, Arabia, Greece, and had visited Rome, and could not be Ignorant of the Christians Rites and Customs in this case, he having been baptized in his Infancy, about the year 185, and his Father, and probably his Grandfather before him Baptiz'd in their Childhood; so that he cou'd witness Infant Baptism to be the practice of the Church from the days of St. *John* in his own Family. Now is it probable that a Man of that Repute, a Publick Person of that Esteem and Learning, would advance and propagate an untruth to Posterity, to the undoing and ruin of his own Reputation, when all the World in those days could contradict him, and in a case so publicly known, and without any advantage to himself? We may therefore; from the premises, trace the Baptism of Infants, in, and from the Days of the Apostles, in those Times, as *Irenaeus* affirms: Where all Churches did agree in the fundamental Doctrines of Religion. With what impudence dare *Curcellaeus*, our old Adversaries, and particularly the Answerer of the Questions of the Athenian Society, Anno. 1691, about Pædobaptism, and R. M. affirm, That for 200 years after Christ, the Baptism of Infants was unknown to the Church, and that it began to be practised in the Third

Century Such Lyes our Antagonists whisper and spread amongst their Ignorant Profelytes, to fix them in their aversion to this holy institution of our Lord Jesus Christ, appointed for the benefit of Infants, as well as of the Adult.

My uncivil and rude Antagonist refuses the Testimony of *Platina*, who in a matter of Fact may be credited, and the constant practice of the *Roman Church* in Baptizing Infants is no despicable evidence of its Primitive and Apostolick Tradition, derived from the Institution of Christ; but my Answerer is mistaken, when he says no writings of those Times affirm it; for besides those I have already mention'd, *Dionysius the Areopagite*, *cap. ult. Clemens l. 6. c. 15.* and others, make mention of it. The Church of *Rome* continued pure and undefiled many Centuries after Christ, and was applauded, and approved of by all the Churches of the World for an Orthodox Church: Therefore in relation to this Rite and Usage, its Authority and constant Practice cannot be rejected, but by our unreasonable Anabaptists.

Mr. *Baxter* observes, that this Order of *Hyginus*, Bilhop of *Rome*, of not receiving Children to Baptism without a Godfather and Godmother, related by *Platina*, is witnessed by the currant consent of Historians. In this order no question is made of the Baptism of Infants, but thereby supposed to be the usage of Christ's Church. Nor doth a

ny other History speak of the beginning of it since the Apostles. Now *Hyginus* lived about the year of our Lord 144, and as *Onuphrius* saith 138, in the days of *Antoninus Pius*, near the time of *Polycarpus*, who had conversed with those, who had seen the Lord, and was by the Apostles made Bishop of *Smyrna*, unto whom Christ addressed an Epistle in the Revelations. So that *Hyginus* living about 40 years after St. *John*, and having been familiar with the Apostles Disciples, he could not be ignorant of their Practice in the Baptizing of Infants, nor could he impose upon the Christian World in a matter of Fact, so publicly known, of which so many Thousands were partakers. There were many Hundreds then alive that could tell what the Apostles did, and whether they or their Parents were Baptized in infancy or not. Can any of us be ignorant what was practised 40 or 50 years ago? Therefore this Testimony of *Platina* is a plain evidence that the Baptism of Infants was in use in the days of the Holy Apostles, and was never question'd, as being the constant Practice of Christians in that Time. For the Testimony of *Cyprian* 'tis so express for the Baptism of Infants, that *Tombs* would have him to be one of the first promoters of it, in his Exam. p. 10, 11. Let his Age and time be *A. D.* 250 or 143. He was, when he was chosen Bishop of *Carthage*, 40 or 50 years old; for few were admitted to that Function before

126 *A Vindication of Infant-Baptism,*

that Age. He must therefore very well understand the practise of the Churches of God of those days, and before the year 200, concerning the Baptism of Infants. And if such a Custom had begun at that time, some mention had been made by him or by others of such an Innovation, and charg'd upon some Persons or Councils; but *Cyprian* mentions it, as the usage of the Churches of God, *That Baptism was not to be denied to Infants, &c.* And sends a long Epistle to *Fidus* a Country Bishop, and affirming withal, *That 'twas the Judgment of above 60 Bishops besides himself then met together.* This is so far from being a forged piece, as *Danvers* boldly supposes, that *St. Hierom* repeats it, Epistle 28. And *St. Austin* and many others own it, as the judgment of that Holy Martyr. But to this evidence so plain for Infant Baptism, my Antagonist is as Mute as a Fish.

He brings a Passage out of *Tertullian*, and saith, that he is the first that speaks of Baptism of Infants, which is false; and tho' he speaks against it, and would have their Baptism delayed till years of discretion, yet by what he saith, we may judge that it was in use in those early Days. And we have less cause to wonder that he was no Friend to Infant Baptism, because he fell in his latter days into grievous Errors; yet in this Treatise *de Baptismo*, he seems to contradict, what he says in another place; for these are his words,

words, c. 12. *Quum vero praescribitur nemini sine Baptismo competere Salutem, &c.* Whereas 'tis declared that Salvation is not to be obtain'd without Baptism, &c. And in his Treatise *de Anima*, the Apostles meaning is to be understood thus, 1 Cor. 7. 14. *That the Children of the faithful are design'd for Holiness, and so for Salvation; that by a Pledge of such hope, he might plead for those Marriages which he would have to be continu'd, otherwise he knew what our Lord had determin'd; Except one be born of Water and the Spirit, he shall not enter into the Kingdom of God; that is, he shall not be Holy. Thus every Soul is reckon'd as in Adam, so long till he be anew enrolled in Christ, and so long unclean till he be so enrolled, and sinful because unclean, &c.* Is this Man here against Infant Baptism? Does not he Plead for the necessity of it from the words of Christ, and the unclean State of *Adam's* Posterity? Does not he declare them to be defiled and in a sinful condition till they be enrolled, that is Baptized? He lived about 100 years after St. *John*, and speaks of the Baptism of Infants, not as any Innovation in the Church, but as an old and practis'd Rite and Custom. If he was not of an Orthodox opinion in one place, he seems to be otherwise in another; for the enrolling and baptizing Infants in case of necessity, and to remedy their uncleanness. And whereas my Schoolmaster saith, *The pure and Apostolick Age knew nothing of Infant Baptism:* This is false, as I have proved in the Testimo-

ny, that *Origen* and others give. What he alleges out of *Justin Martyr*, relates to Adult Persons, converted to the Christian Faith, and concerns not Infants ; and therefore the Martyr had no reason to make any Digression, to speak of Infants and their Reception into the Church, nor *R. M.* to say, That he would have mention'd it here, had it been the Practice of the Church.

My Answerer stuffs his Pamphlet with a Parcel of false Tales, to deceive the Vulgar, in the former Pages and here, by saying, *That Infants Baptism seems not to have been generally received, till the Third Century was well advanced.* Whereas from the premised Quotations of *Justin Martyr, Tertullian, Irenaeus, Origen, &c.* we can trace, and prove it to be an undoubted Right and Practice of the Church, from the Days of Christ and his Holy and Inspir'd Apostles.

The Practice and Judgment of all the Reformed Churches he despises, and says, *I might have spared the Labour of bringing so many of the Protestant Churches against them: For the Anabaptists will not believe in this Case, a Word what they say.* He names them Brethren ; but with what Reason, I shall hereafter examine his Dissimulation in this Title ; but whether they own the Anabaptists, as Brethren, I question, since they abhor their Sect and Heresy as impious, and pernicious to the Church of God, and contrary to the Articles of our Faith. But I would

would ask R. M. Whether they are his Brethren, whom he ranks amongst the Heathens, Turks and Papists? And values them no more than those Infidels and Hereticks, Enemies of the true Christian and Orthodox Faith? I could name a Number of their most Pious and Judicious Learned Doctors, who disown all Brotherhood with, or Relation to such an Antichristian Sect, as the Anabaptists. But the Reason that he gives for his Contempt of their Authority and Practice in this Case, is as weak as the rest of his reasoning. *If the Multitude of Opposers be any sign of a good Cause, I persuade myself, that the Heathens, Turks, or Papists, may plead for their Superstitions with too much advantage over us both.* What an unequal Comparison is this of the Churches of Christ, led by the Spirit of God, enjoying the Light of the Gospel, with all the Assistance of Humane and Divine Learning and Revelation, with Heathens, Turks and Papists, nursed and tutoured up in Ignorance, Unbelief, with Prejudices, and with all the Disadvantages, contrary to the Privileges of the former? Do our Adversaries think that none understand the Will of God in this Case, besides themselves? Are they so conceited, to imagine that true Divine Knowledge and Salvation is attainable only in their Sect? And that all the Churches of Christ are in Error or Damned, besides themselves? Have not we the same Helps to Divine Knowledge and

F. 5

Truth,

130 *A Vindication of Infant-Baptism,*

Truth that they have? Is it probable that their Blue, Green, and Leathern Apron Teachers, are better advised in the Matters of Faith and Practices of Religion, than the most Learned and Pious Governors and Doctors of the Christian Church? If the Heathens, Turks, and Papists, had the same Advantages in Religion as Christians have, they would doubtless embrace our Faith, and forsake their Superstitions. Therefore considering the Circumstances of both, and their want of the Means of Divine Knowledge which we enjoy, *R. M's* Argument is impertinent and unreasonable; but answerable to his weak Capacity and his former Notions.

He adds next, *That perhaps he could shew, that most of those Protestant Churches which he quotes against us, are against the Diocesan Bishops of his Church. And yet he believes he does not think this is a convincing Argument against them.* *R. M.* like a Blind Leader of the Blind, gropes in the dark, and is as ignorant of the Judgment of those Churches, in relation to Episcopacy, as he is of the Truths of the Gospel, and of the Matter in Controversy. All those Protestant Churches that I quote, reverence and highly esteem the Episcopal Order and Constitution of the Church of England, none excepted. The Churches of Sweden and Denmark, tho' Lutherans, have their Bishops; The Churches of the Muscovites, have their Patriarch, and an Episcopal Subor-

Subordination ; The Churches of *Greece* 'tis known, tho' they live under the *Turk*, have yet their Patriarchs, Archbishops and Bishops ; The *Calvinists* Churches in the *Low-Countries*, *Germany*, *Switzerland*, and *France*, are so far from being against our Episcopal Order, that they highly approve of it, admire our Constitution, and willingly submit to it, when their Members come amongst us. I will appeal to the Writings and Letters of *Monf. Osterwald*, late or present Minister of *Newchatel*, to the Letters of *Geneva*, from their University, lately directed to my Right Reverend Diocesan the Bishop of *London*, and to the University of *Oxford*, mention'd in a late *Mercury*. And to shew that the *Calvinists* have been always Friends to our Order and Episcopacy, whatever our Dissenters have whisper'd amongst our People to the contrary, let any Man consult a Letter of *Peter Martyr's*, written at his Return from the Meeting of *Poisy*, mention'd at the End of his *Common-Places*, directed to Mr. *Calvin*, or some other Friend ; where he shall find the Bishop of *Troja* or *Troy* in *Champagne*, at his Arrival at his Inn, paying him a Visit, and declaring, That he was for the Reformation of his Diocess ; and, That he had sent to all the Reformed Ministers, to know how they would receive him as their Bishop, or as their Brother ; and, That they had all agreed to admit him as their Diocesan Bishop. I would have my unadvised Antagonist know, that

132 *A Vindication of Infant-Baptism,*
that all Foreign Churches have a great Veneration for our Episcopal Order; none but our *British* Dissenters, possessed with a Fanatic Spirit of Contradiction, contemn and reject this Primitive and Apostolick Constitution, establish'd in the Church by the Direction of the Holy Ghost. If they have not the same Order amongst them, their Reformation would not bear it at the Beginning, and therefore they could not since conveniently alter their first Establishment.

My abusive Adversary intimates next, That I have falsified the Records, and mangled the Quotations more than *Danvers* and *Tomb*, whom *Mr. Baxter* and *Mr. Wills* have detected and charg'd long since with that Crime, and proved it to their Faces by several Instances; but *R. M.* cannot bring one Record falsified, or Quotation mangled, unless he charges me with the Two Mistakes of the Press in the First Edition: Therefore *R. M.* declares himself in Print to be a publick Slanderer. Again he saith, that I odiously insinuate, that they don't baptize in the Name of the Father, of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, &c. His Mistakes are so many, that I can scarce take notice of them all. I know not what he and those of his Party do in this Case; but divers who bear the Name of Anabaptists, omit the Rule that Christ prescribes at the Dipping of their Profelytes. The *Hutites* and *Socinian* Anabaptists, and many others,

as the *Eutyrians* of old are guilty of this Error. I had therefore Reason to question in what Terms some of them dip their People; but insinuate no such matter in relation to him or his particular Congregation.

But in the next Paragraph, the Devil of Anabaptism appears bare-Faced, without any Disguise, by telling us, *That the Baptism which Infants receive, is not Baptism, but a Nullity, &c.* Let all Men judge from the Premises, whether the Baptism of our Infants be not according to the Prescription and Rule of our Blessed Saviour, both in Subject and Mode. Therefore when he calls it an Error, he proves himself again to be a wicked Slanderer of our Church and Practice, as well as of my Person, and an abusive Tongue and Pen. But *R. M.* speaks in the Language of all Anabaptists, and Catabaptists: For in their Confession of Faith 'tis declared, *That Immersion or Dipping of the Person in Water, is necessary to the due Administration of this Ordinance.* And in their Catechism to this Question, *How is Baptism rightly administered?* Is answer'd, *Baptism is rightly administered by Immersion, or Dipping the Whole Body of the Party in Water, into the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit, according to Christ's Institution, and the Practice of the Apostles; and not by Sprinkling, or Pouring of Water, or Dipping some Part of the Body, after the Tradition of Men.*—See here, how they breed up their young Fry, with

134 *A Vindication of Infant-Baptism,*

with an Aversion to, and Prejudices against our Church and Order; See how they declare our Baptism of Infants by affusion to be erroneous, both in Subject and Mode; See how they proclaim all Churches that use Sprinkling, to Practise the Traditions of Men, and not that of Christ; and therefore R. M. from these Doctrines, concludes our Baptism to be null and void. Shall I explain his Meaning; That consequently we and all other Churches, that use any other Mode, but theirs of Dipping over Head and Ears, are no Christians; That our Churches are no Churches of Christ; That our Ministers are not lawfully Commissioned; That we are Heathens, and in the State of Infidels, without God and Christ; out of the Covenant of Grace, and can claim no Title to Heaven, Happiness, or to the Promises of the Gospel, or to the Redemption of our Blessed *Messiah*; That our Bishops, and the whole Order of the Clergy are Pretenders to and Usurpers of a Function, that they have no Right to exercise; and, That 'tis unlawful to go and hear them, or to join in Communion with them. This is the pernicious Consequence of this devilish Hypothesis, by which they overthrow all Christianity amongst us and other Protestants, and disable the Sacred Function from performing the Duties of their Callings. This was the Opinion of one Cox, mention'd by Mr. Baxter, who went to *Coventry* as a Messenger, to confirm

confirm the Anabaptists there: He said, *It was not lawful to join with our People never so Goodly, because they were not baptized by Dipping.* Tombs and several others were of the same Perswasion; and so is my Antagonist, as appears by what he says. And what Influence this hellish Doctrine may have upon their deluded People, in relation to the Civil Magistrate, and the Sovereign Authority amongst us, let every one judge: For the Anabaptists reckon them also amongst the Infidels, and no Christians; and their Baptism to be null and void. How far this Error may grow and proceed to bolder Attempts against the Government of the Nation, may be easily conjectur'd, if they should be encouraged by Power and their increasing Numbers, as they were at *Munster*. At their first Appearance in that City, they were Humble, Meek, and entertain'd a Familiarity with the Evangelicks; but when they were in a Condition to prescribe Laws, they banish'd them as well as the rest: Therefore this wicked Seet is dangerous to both Church and State, and tends to undermine, and in time to overthrow both. He pretends *St. Cyprian* was of his Mind, to Re-baptize, when the former Baptism was pretended to be null: But *Cyprian* and all other Bishops of those Days, never were of Opinion, That such as were Baptized in Infancy, or by Sprinkling, were not legally Baptized, or that there was any Nullity in that Mode and Subject

Subject of Baptism. But he abuses *Cyprian* and the Bishops of those Days, by misrepresenting their Opinion; for they thought all who return'd to the Church from any Heresy, should be Re-baptized; or such as fell from the Faith, should be received again into the Church by this Laver of Regeneration, and not because their first Baptism was Null. But *Steven*, then Bishop of Rome, reprehended *Cyprian* for this Innovation; and *Dionysius*, Bishop of *Alexandria*, was of a more Orthodox Judgment, and many others condemn'd this Practice as a noted Heresy, and a monstrous Opinion, and an Act contrary to the Christian Faith and Usage, as may be seen in *Euseb. Lib. 8. Cap. 2, 3, 4.*

R. M. seems to be very much offended at my representing out of what Trades and Occupations the *Anabaptists* commonly elect their Teachers. I have reason to complain of the Intrusion into my little Parish of *Tallow-Chandlers, Pedlars, Tinkers, Taylors, Tin-men, &c.* who come to delude my People, and hold forth at a Meeting-House within my Precincts. I have no less cause to complain of their Ignorance, and erroneous Principles, which they instill into the Minds of the unadvised Hearers. But he retorts upon me this Reflection, and saith, *That those who read my Book would think I talk more like a Catechumen, than a Catechist.* *R. M.* must say something, tho' it be never so uncivil, abusive and absurd. At the Beginning of his

his Libel, he seem'd to deny me the Title of a Gentleman, a Scholar, or a Christian; and now he wont allow me to be a Teacher, but a Catechumen. His Judgment is not much to be valned, after the Approbation that I have received from the Learned World, from Three Famous Universities, whereof I have been a Member, and admitted to an honourable Degree in one of ours at home. And as 'tis the ordinary Practice of the Men of his Sect, to abuse and discredit the most Pious and Learned Order of Men of our Church, I have less cause to wonder at his contemptuous Expressions of my Person and Abilities.

But he saith next, *That I slander the Anabaptists as if they had no order or Rule among them.* I know not what Order or Rule they have; but 'tis not such as Christ and his Apostles have left us to imitate, and prescribed to us. The Devils and Evil Spirits of the Infernal Empire, have their Order and Rule; for they have their *Principalities and Powers, and the Rulers of the Darkness of this World*, Ephes. 6. 12. He boasts that they have amongst them Men of good Learning. It may be so; but such were the ancient and Modern *Hereticks*, who employ'd their Wit and Learning to devour, like Wolves, the Flock of Christ, Acts 20. and to draw Disciples after them. But I hope he will not reckon himself amongst these Men of good Learning, who argues so simply, and seems to be

138 *A Vindication of Infant-Baptism,*

be ignorant of his own Catechism, as I have already observed. He informs us next, *That their Churches take care to let none Preach but those, who understand the Word of God and the Grounds of Religion well*; which I cannot find that *R. M.* ever did. To qualify a Man for an *Anabaptist* Teacher, as far as I can understand, if he can Whine handsomly, Bawl strenuously, and Cant properly, devoutly, and demurely, as an Hypocrite; if he can slander the Church of *England*, exclaim against our Function, Discipline, and Devotions; if he can cry out against Sprinkling in Baptism, and quote the usual and mistaken Texts against the Admission of Infants to that Ordinance; if he has but a voluble Tongue, and Confidence enough (I should say Impudence) to speak in Publick, tho' the Man's Learning never reach'd so far as the *Latin Grammar*, he shall be advanced from his Shop-board, or his Anvil, to a Pulpit, tho' he be never so ignorant in the Mysteries of Christianity. In Conscience, are such Men fit and proper Embassadors of our Lord Jesus, and Stewards of the Mysteries of Godliness, who understand not what they are? What Nonsense, Errors, and Blasphemy have often proceeded from the Mouths of such bold Usurpers of, and Intruders into the Sacred Function, *Mr. Pagitt* has given us a mournful Account in his *Herefiography*, as well as divers other Authors upon their certain Knowledge, as *Pontanus*, *Osiander*, *Steid*

Meidan, &c. See *Pagitt*, p. 14. But I cannot but take notice, what he affirms, and Mr. Stennet justifies, that their Churches are the Electors of their Teachers; that is, every particular Congregation, or the People of such a Meeting. And so I find it in their Confession of Faith, *That Bishops, or Elders, and Deacons, are to be chosen by the common Suffrage of the Church it self*; that is, the common People of every such particular Congregation. In this the *Anabaptists* copy after the *Congregational* or *Independent* Model, and fulfil St. Paul's Prophecy to *Timothy*: *The time will come, when they will not endure sound Doctrine; but after their own Lusts shall they heap to themselves Teachers, having itching Ears*, 2 Tim. 4. 3. Here is a plain Discovery of this Sect of the *Anabaptists*, that heaps to it self Teachers from the Scum and Dregs of the Country, the People being Electors. But as St. Paul speaks in another Case, we may say, *That we have no such Custom, nor the Churches of God*, 1 Cor. 11. 16. 'Tis no wonder if they vote for, and promote such for their Teachers, who are their fellow Tradesmen, *Coblers, Tinkers, Porters, Coopers, Butchers*, and such like, who are gifted with nothing but Impudence, Ignorance, and a freedom of Speech. This is not according to the Primitive Pattern of Electing Officers in the Church; Christ glorified not himself, but received his Commission from the Father, and conveys his

Autho-

Authority to his Apostles, *As my Father hath sent me, so send I you*, John 20. 21. Likewise the Apostles ordained and left their Commission to the succeeding Bishops, who may be named Elders, because of their Age and Gravity. But there was always one Superior, or Bishop, in every City, who had the Inspection, Government of, and Superintendency over the rest, as we may understand by the Epistles to *Timothy*, and to *Titus*, and by the concurring Testimony of all succeeding Ages, till these unhappy Days, in which our *Sectaries* have cast off all Reverence and Obedience due by Christ's Appointment to the Episcopal Order and Function, and have set up amongst themselves New Forms and New Modes, as well as New Doctrines, in opposition to the Order recommended to us from the Primitive Churches, and the Holy Apostles. 'Tis certain the Seven Deacons, tho' recommended by the Disciples, were ordained by the Twelve Apostles, *Acts* 6. who appointed Bishops and Elders in every City, *Titus* 1. 5. *1 Tim.* 3. And *Eusebius* tells us, *Lib.* 3. *Cap.* 20. That after St. John was return'd from his Banishment to *Ephesus*, he went into the Country adjoining, being requested partly to Consecrate Bishops, partly to set in order whole Churches, and partly to choose by Lot unto the Ecclesiastical Function of them, whom the Holy Ghost had assigned. And in his *Lib.* 6. *Cap.* 42. he brings in *Cornelius*, Bishop

Bishop of Rome, saying, *That there ought to be but one Bishop in the Catholick Church*; He means in every City. To these Bishops it belong'd to ordain Ministers, witness the same Author, *Lib. 6. Cap. 22.* Speaking of Origen, *That he was made Minister at Cæsarea, of the Bishops there abiding* In all the Records of the Primitive Churches it appears, that the power of Election and Ordination of Presbyters and Deacons, was lodg'd chiefly in the Bishops of the several Dioceses, tho' the People gave their Testimonials and Approbation.

Mr. Stenner, in answer to Mr. Broome, justifies the People's Election, and the pretended Ordination of all the *Anabaptist* Church-Officers, without exception, as warrantable, from *Act. 6.* This we deny, that this Text, or any other of Holy Scripture, unto which we appeal in this Case, implies any such Right in the People. The Superior Officers, as *Apostles*, were chosen and call'd by Christ, who derived his Mission from God the Father. And they would not presume to nominate one instead of the Traytor Judas, without God's Approbation by a Lot, which fell on *Matthias*. The succeeding Bishops, Presbyters, or Elders, were elected and ordained by them, and by virtue of their Commission from their Master. *For this cause*, saith the Apostle to Titus, *1. 5.* *I left thee in Crete, that thou shouldest set in order the Things that are wanting, and ordain Elders in every City, as I had*

142 *A Vindication of Infant-Baptism,*
had appointed thee. God never granted to the
Mob a Rite of chusing to the Sacred Function
such Officers, whose Authority immediately
depends upon him: 'Tis a presumptuous
Usurpation of the Divine Power, to pretend
to any such Right, which being originally
derived from God, was by him entrusted in
the Apostles, and their Successors the Bi-
shops of the Christian Church. Neither are
the vulgar People capable of such a Choice,
to understand who are fit Persons to under-
take the Function of a Minister of Christ:
They may judge of their Morals, but they
are no competent Judges of their Learning
and Abilities. Besides, if this were allowed,
it would follow, That the Authority of Ad-
ministring the Sacraments, and the other
Powers committed by Christ to his Church-
Officers, were now lodg'd in the Body of the
People; for none can give to another, what
he hath not. And none hath Power to elect,
or ordain to a Function in Christ's Church,
which was never granted from above. 'Tis
true, the Election of the Seven *Deacons* was
made by the Disciples; but they were first
empower'd by the Apostles, *v. 3. Look ye
out among you Seven Men of honest Report, &c.*
but they add, *whom we may appoint over this
Business.* The People had from the Apostles,
liberty to recommend; but the Ordination
and Appointment was reserved for them.
Again, we may observe, that these were
inferior Officers, chosen to act in Subordi-
nation

ation to the Apostles, and never had any immediate Commission from God, as they had, and were entrusted with the Poors Stock, with serving of Tables, &c. Mr. Stennet questions, whether 'tis not as reasonable, that the People should chuse the Persons, under whose care they entrust their Souls, as their Purfes? I answer the case is different; They are no proper Electors of God's Officers and Stewards in his House, as they are of fit managers of Money; neither is it the People who entrust these Officers, but God, witness *Paul's words, Acts 20 28. to the Elders of Ephesus, Take heed unto your selves and to all the flock, over the which the Holy Ghost hath made you overseers, to feed the Church of God, which he hath purchased with his own Blood; observe, the Holy Ghost, not the People, hath made you overseers.* Therefore there is this difference between us, and the Anabaptist Teachers: We are God's Ministers, they are the Peoples. We are entrusted by God, with the care of Souls; they are entrusted by the deluded Vulgar. We have receiv'd our Commission and Authority from Christ and his Bishops; they have no Authority but from the suffrages of an Heretical and Schismatical Mob. Judge ye therefore what kind of Ministers of Christ these Men are to be esteem'd, who, as our Adversaries confess, have their Powers only from the Votes of the People, who chuse and heap to themselves Teachers, having itching ears,
for

144 *A Vindication of Infant-Baptism;*
for they will not endure sound Doctrine, 2. Tim.
4, 3. But give heed unto seducing Spirits, and
Doctrines of Devils, 1 Tim. 4. Have the
bold Usurpers of Christ's Authority in the
Church, any liberty from him of admin-
istering Sacraments, or of acting as God's Min-
isters? No more than the *Turkish* Caliphs
and Musties. What trust or dependance
their miserable People have upon such Blind
Leaders of the Blind? As they proceed with-
out any Legal Warrant from God, their Exe-
cution of the Ministerial Function is un-
warrantable and vain, and 'tis no Blasphemy
to name them as really they are, *Wolves*
in Sheeps cloathing, Agents and Factors of the
Devil, the grand deceiver, whose interest
they promote in divers cases, but particular-
ly in the engagement and promise, they im-
pose upon them whom they dip: They re-
quire from them a Vow, never to forsake their
Sect, never to hear or adhere to any other
Perswasion or Denominations of Christians
to abandon the Church and Clergy of Eng-
land; to keep to that Congregation, in which
they have been dipped, to keep a Tradition
within themselves, and to employ no heret-
iccrafts Men but of their own Profession
as I am inform'd, &c. So that as Christ's
design and interest in his Church, is Uni-
nity and Union; these Men by this means
are divided from the Body of Christianity
and Cantoned amongst themselves; for every
Congregation hath its particular Bishop
Elder

Elder, or Pastor as they name them, elected and chosen by the suffrages of Men, Women, and Adult Children. Judge ye of the worthy choice from such scandalous Principals, and how contrary this Sect is to the design of Christ in our Redemption, which is, that we might all be One; for the end and drift of Anabaptism is Division. Let not Mr. Stenmet and Mr. Hooke boast and proclaim their Charity that they have for the Church of England and their Doctrines and Proceedings declare us to be all Heathens, and are very cruel to us, as I shall examine elsewhere. What an Infatuation must these People be in, to sit contented under the Tuition of such Ignorant deceivers? And tho' in the primitive Church the People may have had a Vote of Approbation in the choice of some Church-Officers, their Authority and Commission was handed to them from Christ's Delegates, the Bishops of the Christian Church, who only have Power from our great Master of Ordination. Therefore in the days of Constantine, when any of the Barbarous Nations were converted to the Faith, they required a Bishop to be sent to them for that purpose, that the Execution of the Ministerial Function might be legal, and conformable to the apostolick Pattern. And in the latter ages, some of the Gaulois sought out an Orthodox Bishop, to give ordination to their Ministers.

I must here examine and answer the mistakes and fallacies of Mr. Joseph Hook's

146 *A Vindication of Infant-Baptism,*

3d Chapter of his *Apology*, where he affirms *That the baptized Believers are a true Church of Christ.* He pretends himself an Apostle or Messenger amongst these People, and tells us that he was ordained a Gospel Minister by *Francis Stanley* and *Thomas Grantham*, the one a *Presbyter*, and the other a *Messenger* of the Churches, p. 37. the People electing him to these Offices against his will; now if neither *Stanley*, nor *Grantham*, nor the People had Power from Christ, nor from any delegated by him to ordain this Man, What signifies their Ordination and Imposition of Hands? No more than if he had been ordain'd by the *Turkish Cadis*, or the *Jewish Rabbies*. In this Chapter he promiseth to prove this Sect to be a true Church of Christ, by being Gathered, Constituted, and Govern'd according to the Doctrine of our Blessed Saviour, and his Holy Apostles, in conformity to the Primitive Pattern; but how well he proves it, I purpose here to examine.

His first Position is, *That the Anabaptist Church's Gathering, is according to the Doctrine of our Saviour and his Apostles, and conformable to the Primitive Pattern.* This is false; for they can never prove that any Authority or Commission is deriv'd to them from Christ to Preach the Gospel and Baptize, as the Apostles had. Their proceedings have no warrant from God, or his blessed Son, or Holy Spirit; they are bold Usurpers of the Sacred

Function

Function, Intruders into the Ministry, Promoters of Schism and Division; neither are their proceedings answerable or conformable to the Apostolick Practices. They Baptized not only the Masters and Mistresses of Families upon their Profession of Faith; but also their Households, as that of *Lydia*, *Acts* 16. 15. and that of the Jaylor, *Acts* 16. 31, 33. But these deceivers exclude out of the Church a great part of our Households, and will not admit them to the Seal of God's Covenant, which is Baptism; the *Apostles* were for Unity amongst believers, but these are Separatists. The *Apostles* frequented the *Jewish Synagogues*, and corresponded with the former People of God in their Devotions in the Temple, and were conformable to *Moses*, tho' he was out of date, for fear of giving offence. But these break of all Union with all sincere and devout Christians, treat them as *Heathens* and *Infidels*, and have forsaken their Churches and Communion as infectious, contrary to Christ's Command and Prayer; therefore they are Apostates. They are not for gathering, but for scattering the Church by their Pernicious Principles. Again, the *Holy Apostles* establish'd but one Church in every City, all the faithful were there joyn'd in one fellowship; but these *Disciples of Satan* have, in opposition to Christ's design in our Redemption, divided and canon'd themselves from his true Church, into divers Synagogues or Conventicles, and since

148 *A Vindication of Infant-Baptism,*

separate from one another ; so great an influence has the foul and turbulent Spirit of Division upon these deluded People, that they are not only separated from us, but amongst themselves they are now Sub-divided into Eight or Nine Sects, that disagree in many Articles ; but agree in their enmity to our Establish'd Church. Mr. *Hooke* mentions Twelve Cities where the Disciples of Christ made profession of the Faith, and saith, That they were not gathered in a *National Way* ; as if an Union and Communion with and between all Christ's Disciples in a Nation were a reproach to us and contrary to the Primitive Pattern. What a foolish exception is this, for a Messenger or an *Apostle* of Christ ? Was not the *Jewish Church* a *National Church* of God ? Had not they Infant Members ? And when whole Nations were converted to Christianity, did they not all agree in one form of Worship ? And such as did thus agree, as the *Greek*, the *Egyptian*, the *Roman*, &c. Were not these National Churches of Christ in the Primitive Times ? They had no *Anabaptists* to quarrel at their Unity and Agreement ; but all Orthodox and true Disciples were obedient and conformable to the Publick Orders and Constitutions. And as for the Baptism of Infants, and admitting them to be Church-Members, I have already proved it to have been the Command of Christ, and the Practice of the Apostles and Church of God in all Ages. Therefore our

Messenger's

Messenger's saying, That they only have the true *Ancient Primitive* or *Apostolical* mark of Church-Gathering, is altogether false, and an Impudent Assertion, contrary to their true and known Practice; for did ever any of the Apostles Baptize Men into any particular Sect, as the *Anabaptists* are wont to dip their Proselytes, and engage them to renounce all Communion with all Christians. Did they instill in, and oblige them to such pernicious principles of Division? Does not St. Paul plead for Unity, and enjoyn all Christ's Disciples to Love, Union, and mutual Fellowship in the Publick Worship of God? *Ephes. 4.* Does not he tell the *Romans, c. 16, 17.* *I beseech you Brethren, mark them which cause Division and Offences contrary to the Doctrine which ye have Learned, and avoid them?* Can any Man of reason judge these *Anabaptists*, acting so contrary to the Mind of Christ, and the Doctrine of the Apostles and their Practice in gathering their Churches, to be *Apostolical*, and according to the *Primitive Pattern*? The Second Assertion is as false as the first; That their Church Constitution was according to the *Primitive Pattern*, Here I observe, that Mr. Hooke, this pretended *Apostle of Christ* understands not the Right Constitution of a Church of God; for contrary to what he says, Churches may be rightly gathered, and yet the Constitution may be Irregular, Unwarrantable and Erroneous. To inform him, A true Church of Christ is a Society of Christians,

150 *A Vindication of Infant-Baptism,*

ftians, Men, Women, and Children, lawfully call'd out of the World by the Preaching of the word, and the Right Administration of the Sacraments, to the Participation of Grace and Glory; and tho' there may be many particular parts of this Church distinguish'd in a Nation into feveral Parishes or Congregations, and in the World distinguish'd into feveral Nations, yet this Church is said to be but *One* in *Christ*, *Gal. 3. 28.* and *Ephes. 4. 4.* The *Apostle* perfwades them to the Unity of the Spirit in the Bond of Peace, because there is but *one Body*, one Mystical Body, into which they had been Baptized by *one Baptism*. Likewise *Christ* promifeth, *John 10. 16.* That all his Sheep shall be brought together, and *there shall be one Fold, and one Shepherd*. They are to be brought by the Preaching of the word, by Faith and gentle means, and not by Violence nor Compulfion. We are not for Persecutions, we abhor the late methods derived from Popish Practices, Principles and Councils; but there is one material thing required in a Church of *Christ*, a lawful Ministry by *Christ's* Appointment and Ordination, deriving from him their Authority, and not from the People. For *Christ's Church* is a *Monarchy*, not a *Democracy*; and he is the King as well as Supreme Prophet of his People; and as the Congregation have no Liberty to invent new Articles of Faith, and new Administrations, neither have they Power to appoint new Administrators.

The

The Texts he mentions, 1 Cor. 12. 18, 27, 28. speak against him; for God, not the Mob, has appointed chief Officers to act in Christ's name in the Church; therefore when he saith that their Ministry is of a divine Authority, it is false. It concerns them to prove the Divinity of their Mission, which we deny. To tell us, *That they have three sorts of Ordained Officers amongst them, to wit, Messengers, Elders and Deacons, which we find to have been in the first Churches,* answers not the Question. What signifies the assigning such names conformable to the Primitive Pattern to their Officers? Does only the name give them the Authority of Christ's Ministers? We deny their Commission to be from God, whatever Titles they give them, and cannot look upon them but as Satan's Agents and Chaplains, while they promote his Empire, as really they do. Mr. Hooke hath not one Syllable to prove the Divine Authority of their *Anabaptist Officers*, as he pretended, neither can he or any of his party make it appear, that their Power is from Christ, but only from an Heretical Conventicle of their Sect. *Fasting and Prayer* may be practis'd by them in imitation of the first *Christians*; for we often find the Devil God's Ape, and his Factors personating Christ's Ministers. That there were *Apostles*, or *Angels*, or *Messengers*, in the Primitive Church, besides the chief *Apostles*, proves not the matter in Question; for they were call'd and set apart by the *Holy Ghost*,

152 *A Vindication of Infant-Baptism,*

Acts 13. 2, 4. *Ephes.* 4. 11. They had their Commission from God, and were enabled for the Ministry with the Gift of Tongues by the Holy Ghost in an extraordinary manner, and were sent abroad by the *Apostles*, *Christ's immediate Agents*: But how comes the *Ana-baptist Teachers* to be *Apostles of Christ*? They must prove their Mission to be *Ordinary* or *Extraordinary*; if *Ordinary*, it must be from them who are *Christ's Substitutes* here on Earth, which none can pretend to be, but the Bishops, who have derived their Authority lineally from the *Apostles*, as may be proved from Age to Age till this Time. If they pretend to an *Extraordinary Mission*, we expect from them a *Miracle* to evidence it, as was usual in such cases, both in the *Old* and *New Testament*; for we are not to be satisfied with empty boasting and vain pretences. Their calling the Names of their *Officers* as the *Apostolick Churches* did, is no Proof of the same Authority as was vested in them, *1 Cor.* 4. 9, 20. But Mr. *Hooke* disowns amongst them any *Extraordinary Call*, neither can he prove an *Ordinary one*, such as is agreeable with the Holy Scripture, such as is evidently derived to them from Christ or his Commissioned *Apostles*.

To dispute about the Alteration of the Names of the Church Officers, is not material to our Purpose: I suppose we can prove
that

that we retain yet the same Names as were in use in the Primitive Church, of *Bishops*, who succeeded to the *Apostles* in their Authority and Command in the Church; of *Presbyters* or *Elders*, who assisted the *Bishops* in Preaching, and of *Deacons*. To quarrel at the Name of *Priest*, which is, as we understand it, an Abbreviation of the Name of *Presbyter*, is childish and ridiculous; for Names depend upon the Usage of the Country, and come from the Choice of Men, and are innocent and insignificant in themselves, without the Sense that is given to them by Custom. And as our Adversaries approve of the Name of *Presbyter*, in the Offices of Christ, the Name of *Priest* is the same in our Meaning, as the other is to them. Let them not dream of Sacrifices and Offerings, when we call an Order in the Church by that ancient Title; tho' in that Respect and Signification the Name may be proper to them, when in the publick they offer up the Spiritual Sacrifices of Prayers and Praises of the Congregation to God. And if that Name may be proper to every Believer upon that account, according to St *Peter's* Saying, 1 *Pet.* 5. 2. as Mr. *Hooke* acknowledges, How much rather ought such to be dignified with that Title, who are the Representatives of their People, to offer up their Supplications and Thanksgivings to the Throne of Grace? Therefore his Exception is frivolous, *That he does not find that the*

154 *A Vindication of Infant-Baptism,*
Gospel Church should have any such ordained
Officers.

He endeavours next to prove, That true Ordination is certainly found in the Baptized Church. *First*, Because as he says, *They have true Baptism*; which we deny: For tho' the *Anabaptists* may have *Right Subjects*, who profess their Faith, a *Right Matter*, Water, *Right Words*, which some have not, who baptize them only in the Name of the Lord Jesus, a *Right Manner* which we question not; yet they have not *Right Administrators*, impower'd by Christ to execute that Office, and I think every Lay Disciple is allow'd by them to dip their Profelytes. Besides, their Dipping being a Renunciation of the former Baptism, is not into the Church of Christ, but into their Pernicious Sect, as may appear by the Engagement they enter into at that time, contrary to the Mind of our Redeemer, and tending to Schism and Division. For these Reasons we look upon their Baptism to be criminal, an Apostacy from their former Profession, a meer Nullity as to the Remission of Sins, and no otherwise than if they had been Dipped by the *Turkish Caliphs* or *Musties*, or their *Dervises*. And as it is in opposition to their former lawful Baptism, 'tis Seditious, Heretical and Irregular.

He adds: *Now Baptism precedes Ordination; and where there is no true Baptism, there can be no Right Ordination, in an Ordinary way.* Here
the

the *Friendly Hypocrite* pulls off his Mask, and tells us in plain Terms, That as we have no true *Baptism* in our Church, our *Ordinations* of Church Officers, of *Bishops*, *Priests*, and *Deacons*, are null and insignificant; That we are no Ministers of *Christ*; That our Preaching and Administrations are vain, &c. How many Lamentable Consequences may we gather from this *Friendly Doctrine*? Is this the Kindness Mr. *Hooke* professeth for our Church and Ministry, to blow us all up at once? Here this Spawn of the Jesuit discovers his Malice at the Church of *England*; but as I have proved, by Holy Scripture and Right Reason, our Mode of Baptism to be Good, and the Subjects to be agreeable to the Will and Command of *Christ*, I shall not here contend with this Viper, that labours to sting to Death the Bosom that harbours him and his Party, and grants them a Toleration.

As to the Populous Elections of the Church Officers, I deny that the People have any such Power or Right from *Christ*, to appoint *Bishops* or *Presbyters* in the Church, which we find depending upon *Christ* and his Holy Spirit, and exercising a Function in the Church, not derived to them from the People, as I have already proved. So *Acts* 14. 23. and elsewhere, the Apostles are said to ordain Elders in every Church; 'tis suppos'd, not without the Cognizance of the People, who had nothing to object against them, but gave

156 *A Vindication of Infant-Baptism,*
gave them their Approbation. But as
Christ's Dominion in his Church is *Monarchi-*
cal, the Right and Power of *Ordination* is
not lodg'd, nor committed to the Body of
the People, but to the *Apostles* and their *Suc-*
cessors, the *Bishops* of the Christian Church, as
I could prove more at large, from the Word
of God and Primitive Antiquity. There-
fore what Mr. Hooke saith, *That they have*
Christ's lawful Ministers, qualified, chosen and
ordained, according to the Word of God, is
altogether false. For the Government that
they have amongst them, I have little to
say; but that the Definition of a True
Church in our 19th *Article*, agrees with their
Church I deny; for I can prove they are
several Distinct Congregations instead of
Faithful Men, of *Apostates*; and that neither
the true Word of God is Preach'd amongst
them, nor the Sacraments duly Administred
according to Christ's Ordinance, as I have
already made it appear. And some of them
are *Seventh-day Baptists*, *Pelagians*, *Socini-*
ans, *Fifth-monarchy-Men*, *Antinomians*, *Soul*
Sleepers, &c. And have these and other
Hereticks amongst them, the Word of God
purely preach'd who are guilty of *Horrid*
Blasphemies, as I could prove. Let them
not appeal to their *Confessions of Faith*, they
are publish'd to deceive the World. Not
one Congregation, believes all the Articles
as are there laid down, but differ from them
in several Particulars. And 'tis remarkable,
the

by the Act of Toleration, they are obliged to sign and subscribe to most of the Articles of our Church, to capacitate them to hold their *Conventicles*, they can with a Jesuitical *Equivocation*, and *Mental Reservation*, sign to what they don't believe, profess, or teach. What can we think of such Teachers? Are these Apostolick or truly Christian? I shall examine the other Part of Mr. *Hooker's* Apology, and discover by the Word of God and Reason, his pernicious Delusions and Fallacies, next to Mr. *Stenner's*.

Now my Answerer *R. Morgan* proceeds on his Mistakes, from the Beginning to the end of the Chapter. *For I think it*, saith he, *to Dishonour for a true Minister of Christ to labour as Paul did when necessity requires.* But to chuse such Men to be Teachers of the people, who know nothing but their Mechanical Trades, who were never bred up but in secular Employments, nor qualified for the function by any former Studies, and who have no other internal Call, but from their Pride, Hypocrisy, Ambition, Vain-glory, Desire of Gain, &c. nor no other outward, but the Suffrages of the Mob and common people, who are willing and ready to gratify such as are likely to promote their Interest, and increase their Numbers: We may confidently affirm such Men to be no Ministers of Christ, nor to have any lawful Ordination. He tells us, or *Epictetus* an Eminent Philosopher,

158 *A Vindication of Infant-Baptism,*

pher, formerly a Slave; and Ammonius a Carrier of Sacks of Corn, who after they had applied themselves to study, became Eminent in Learning; and the Disciples, Prophets, and Apostles, were all inspired with the Spirit of God. What is this to our Case? Are the Leathern, Blue, and Green-Apron Teachers, amongst the *Anabaptists*, inspired with a Divine Spirit, and enabled by the Holy Ghost for the Function, as the Apostles were? He concludes and ends as he began his scandalous Pamphlet, by base Reflections, uncivil Language, false Aspersions and Accusations, that deserve no other Answer from me but Contempt and Scorn. Now I leave him to the Judgment of him, who saith, *That Vengeance belongeth to me, I will recompence, saith the Lord.* And again, *The Lord shall judge his People,* Heb. 10. 30. I leave him to the Justice of my Great Lord and Master, who declares, *That he that despiseth you, despiseth me; and he that despiseth me, despiseth him that sent me.* We are the true Ministers of Christ, these Innovators are but Intruders into the Ministry, and as Christ names them, Thieves and Robbers, John 10. 1. We can produce our lawful Calls, both inward and outward; These have no other Authority to shew but the Suffrages of a Crue or Company of deluded People: We have Power to act in the Church, as the Servants of Christ, and Stewards of the Mysteries of God; but these

are

re no Ministers of Christ, but Promoters of the Devil's Interest and Kingdom, by spreading abroad their Heretical Doctrines and Erroneous Principles. I think I don't break through the Rules of Modesty, nor use any unbecoming Language to give these Usurpers of the Sacred Function, these Deceivers of the Nation their Right Titles, and in imitation of Christ and of his Holy Apostles, to reprove them for their Hypocrisy and Form of Godliness, and denying the Power thereof; for the Cruelty to their Infants, to shut them out of the Covenant of Grace, unto which Christ invites them; for their uncharitable Censure of all *Protestant Churches*, by judging their Baptism null, and their Condition no better than that of Heathens; for spreading abroad, and imposing upon the People false Doctrines to gain Profelytes; and for their Injustice to offer to dispossess our Infants of a Right they have peaceably enjoy'd above Fifteen Hundred Years, without any Contradiction, upon an idle and false Pretence, that 'tis not expressly mention'd in the *New Testament*. They have not one little in the Word of God to favour their pernicious Heresy, when rightly understood; nor any thing from the best and purest Antiquity, to support their Cause, as we have made it appear: Therefore R. M. concludes his Pamphlet with almost as many Falsities as Sentences.

But

But now 'tis time to leave him to God and his Condemnation, to examine a few of Mr. Stennet's Reflections: a more Civil, a more Rational and Learned Adversary, on Mr. R's Sixth Chapter, concerning the *Anabaptists Teachers*, of whom I have been discouraging. We grant, that *a secular Employment, in case of necessity, is not unbecoming a Minister of Christ*; but to chuse from thence the most part of your *Elders* or *Bishops*, and *Messengers*, as you call them, is scandalous. And those who have no Authority derived from Christ, to warrant such Men to Preach and Administer the Sacraments, What a sad Condition are your People in, who depend upon such Impostors, and Counterfeit Ministers of Christ, and follow such blind Guides, in the great Business of their Salvation? 'Tis true, that the Restriction of the Priesthood to one Tribe under the Law, does not confine the Ministry under the Gospel only to Men of one Tribe or Nation, or to those of one Rank and Condition, as to their temporal Circumstances: But yet, as they had a Call from God to execute that Function amongst his Jewish People, none ought now to presume to take any Ecclesiastical Office upon him, or to act in Christ's Church in his Name, and by his Authority, without a lawful Commission from God, which he ought to produce, and satisfy others, as well as his own Conscience, of his just Right and Power. And 'tis a pernicious Doctrine and Inlet to all disorder in

this

this case, to tell us in their publick Confession, That the *Work of Preaching the Word* is not so peculiarly confin'd to the *Bishops and Pastors of the Churches*, but that others also, *gifted and fitted by the Holy Spirit for it, and approved and called by the Church, may and ought to perform it.* These Gifted Men they understand to be inspired from above by Miracle, without the Laborious Study of Divinity or Languages; and by their Church, the Meeting of their People together of all sorts and Conditions of Men and Women. But how came they by their Right of choosing Christ's Ministers without his Warrant? which we deny was ever granted to them from our Redeemer? These Mechanics therefore are no lawful Ministers of our Lord, no rightful Administrators of God's Ordinances; their Authority is vain, their dipping in God's and Christ's Name unwarrantable, and not for the Remission of sins, but into their pernicious *Se*ct; and their Baptism is null, void, and of no Effect. 'Tis true, *Elisha* was call'd to that Sacred Work from the Plow, *David* from the Sheep-fold, and *Amos* from the Herd; but these and others were nominated by God, as *Aaron* was, and inabled with many Divine Gifts and Graces, for the better discharge of their function; but none will say, that the Blue, Green, and Leathern-Apron Preachers, are thus inspired from above or have the Holy spirit for that purpose. Mr. Stennet grants

162 *A Vindication of Infant-Baptism,*

an inward and an outward Call to be necessary in all such as undertake the Ministry: Now we cannot judge these Men to have either, for that intended purpose. But my Answerer seems to allow, that some of the *Anabaptists* Teachers run before they are sent, and these they disown. They would do well to put upon all they ordain, a *Character* of Distinction, as the Church of *Rome* does upon all their Priestly Order, by shaving their Crowns; and as the *Turks*, at the Circumcision of the Adult and Renegado's, by printing a Half Moon upon their Breasts; that we may know who is a Minister sent, and who is not; who is an approved Teacher of the *Anabaptists*, and who is not. As for the Names they bestow upon them, of *Bishops*, or *Elders*, and *Messengers*, or *Apostles*, 'tis to be observed, that they have inverted, in their Confession of Faith, the Order of Christ's Establishment, by naming the Latter after the Former, whereas they ought to be before: But their whole Sect is a Subversion of Christ's Laws and Ordinances; therefore this is not one of the least Errors that they are guilty of. Now, for the Honour of their Teachers, they must give me leave to publish a List of their Names and Occupations of as many as I could get, and of the Places of their Abode and Meeting-Houses in and about *London* which the Reader may see at the End of this Book.

Arguments taken from Mr. Baxter's plain
Scripture Proof of Infant Church-Mem-
bership and Baptism.

THIS excellent Man, as he tells us in his Preface, was doubtful at first what to think of the *Anabaptists*; but after he had examin'd the Word of God, and the Records of *Antiquity*, they fix'd his Judgment, and settled his Mind in relation to this Controversy. Therefore he writ in opposition to Mr. *Tombes*, chosen Lecturer of *Bewdley*, who endeavour'd to perswade all his Congregation to be Dipped by him, and Preach'd several Sermons for that purpose; but was very angry, that his Exhortations made no greater Impression upon his People. Mr. *Baxter* therefore, to prevent the Mischiefs of *Anabaptism* in those Parts, writes this Book, and begins with Ten Propositions, that he lays down for the better understanding the Question in dispute. *First*, That the Holy Ghost speaks of some things in Scripture more fully, and of others more sparingly; the latter is doubtless the more difficult to understand, yet a Divine Truth. In four Cases God speaks more sparingly; of the Salvation of Heathens, and of their Infants; yet he is pleas'd to distinguish between the Children of Believers, and of Infidels. God speaks more sparingly of Mat-
ters

ters of lesser moment; but of those that are of an absolute necessity to Salvation, more fully. God speaks more fully of the things that were disputed in those Times, and of others more sparingly. Again, The *New Testament* speaks more sparingly of the things revealed in the *Old*. Both being the Word of God, there was no need of a Repetition of God's Will, so fully and sufficiently revealed in the former: This is our Case. The Question is not, By what Sign Members are to be admitted into the Church; or, Whether by a Sign or without; but at What Age they are to be admitted? Now this is expressly commanded by God in the *Old Testament*, What need of any New Order to that Purpose, since he hath so plainly revealed his Will in the *Old Testament*, and signified his Pleasure in the *New*, tho' not so clearly? We have divers Cases parallel to this, as the Degrees of Marriage forbidden in the *Old*, and not in the *New*; yet 'tis a sinful Act to violate a Law that was there prohibited. So likewise the Scripture in the *New Testament* is silent in relation to a Christian Magistracy, and the Observation of the *Lord's Day* with that Devotion, as the *Jewish Sabbath* was observed; yet we doubt not but that our Obedience is required by God to those Laws, so plainly expressed in the *Old Testament*.

The *Second* Position is, That the difficulty in finding out the Truth, and God's Will in any Question, is no Proof that 'tis not of God; for 'tis his Pleasure thereby to exercise our Faith, Obedience, Inquisition, and Study in Divine Matters.

The *Third* Position is, That if Truth appears never so plain it may not be able to convince such as are prejudiced against it by Education, Interest, Custom, Pre-occupation, Ignorance, &c. Therefore Truth is not to be undervalued because such Men reject it, who are thus misled, and Enemies of it. Neither are we to think the worse of Truth, because Men of Learning or Conscience oppose it.

The *Fourth* Position is, That when a Case appears to us not so clear and certain as may be expected, we ought to incline to the greatest Probability. Now I dare appeal to any indifferent Person, Whether 'tis the Mind of Christ to exclude Infants out of his Covenant? he having been so favourable to invite them to him. And as there is no other outward Method appointed for their Admission, but Baptism, Whether 'tis not his Will, that they should be Baptized?

The *Fifth* Position is, That wise and conscientious Christians are not to be too rash in changing their Judgments in Matters of Religion, since divers Errors are damnable, and of a pernicious Consequence, as this
now

166 *A Vindication of Infant-Baptism,*

now in question ; they ought to desire God's assistance by Prayer, examine well the Matter in dispute, hear both Parties, before they alter their Opinions ; and consult those whom God hath set over them to instruct them, or others, who may be better able to advise them. They are to take heed that they be not inveigled with an Appearance of Sanctity, nor cheated by deceitful Arguments, nor terrified by vain Notions ; but to allow to themselves time and means, to consider and consult in a Case where the Salvation of their Souls is so highly concern'd.

The *Sixth* Position is, That the overthrow of a Man's former weak Grounds, is not the overthrow of the Truth, which he held ; for it may be supported by other stronger Arguments, that we may be ignorant of. Therefore to renounce our Orthodox Persuasion, because of our Mistakes, and know not how to maintain it by Scripture or Reasons, upon which we formerly depended, is a great Indiscretion and Error.

The *Seventh* Position, That when some Men have been baffled by others of a greater reach of Wit and Learning, and their weak Performances and Arguments answer'd with the Adversaries applause, it ought to be no prejudice to the Truth that they maintain. 'Tis not to be denied, that some have argued very weakly for *Infant-Baptism*, used many unfit Phrases, and

quoted

quoted many misapplied Texts of Scripture : There is no difficulty to Triumph and overcome such an *Adversary*, who furnishes his *Antagonist* with Weapons to beat him, by Contradictions, Inconsistences, obscure Expressions, or want of Sense, that he may be guilty of ; for all that, the Truth and Cause that he maintains ought not to suffer by it, while others can vindicate and prove the Matter in question : A School-Boy of *Westminster*, may ridicule the most undoubted Truths with his flashy Wit.

The *Eighth* Position is, That one sound Argument is sufficient to prove any thing true, if all others should fail. Error hath no real Foundation, neither in Scripture, nor in sound Reason ; but Truth is established upon both. Two Witnesses are required amongst Men, to justify Truth ; but God's single Witness in one Text of Scripture, is as good as Ten Thousand. Tho' we have many to prove our Belief and Practice, in relation to *Infant-Baptism*, some may be affected with, and better comprehend one more than another.

The *Ninth* Position is, That the former and present Customs of the Churches of Christ, Orthodox in their Belief and Practices, ought to be of some weight with prudent and considerate Christians, in Cases controverted and beyond their reach. We have proved *Infant-Baptism* to be the Usage of the Christian Church, as near to the Apostles

168 *A Vindication of Infant-Baptism,*

Apostles Days as there is any sufficient History extant to inform us. And for the present Churches of Christ, none excepted they all Baptize Infants: Certainly they and we cannot all be in an Error, and only a few *Mechanick Anabaptists*, for the most part, of the Dregs of the People, in the Right; when we have at least as much Learning and Divine Assistances as they can pretend to

The *Tenth* Position is, That plain Consequences and Arguments drawn by Reason from Scripture, are as sufficient proof as the express Words of a Text. The Words without the Meaning and Reason, are insignificant; but the right Meaning and Reason are proof enough. The Devil made use of Words of Scripture against Christ as the *Anabaptists* do against us; but both want the Meaning and Reason on their side as we have made it appear. Christ's proving to the *Sadduces* the Immortality of the Soul, and Resurrection of the Dead from God's saying, *I am the God of Abraham, of Isaac, and of Jacob*, is a notable Instance in this Case — This was no plain proof of either Doctrine; but by this Reason, *God is not the God of the Dead, but of the Living*. If we imitate our Saviour in his reasoning upon Holy Scripture, I don't think we shall abuse or pervert it, or add any thing to it, as my rude and uncivil Adversary charges me.

Now

Now I cannot but enumerate here the dismal Consequences of this pernicious and hellish Doctrine of the *Anabaptists*, as Mr. *Baxter* hath set them down: They all deny infants their Church Membership, and room in the Visible Church, and a share in the Covenant of Grace, unless when they join with the *Antinomians*, and tell us of an absolute Covenant, and call God's Election (of which none can be certain without complying with the Means) his *Covenant*: They deny the natural Interest which Parents have in their Children, to make a *Covenant* in their Names, and for them: They call that common and unclean, which God hath called Holy: They give us a new Model of the Visible Church, of their own Invention in the Materials of it: They provoke Christ to anger, in forbidding Children to be brought to him into his Church: They are so audacious, as to repeal a part of the *Old Testament*, which they can never prove, that God hath repealed: They deprive Parents of all Assurance of the Salvation of their Children, who die unbaptized, without which they can have no undoubted Right to the Promises of God: They deny them an Entrance into Christ's Visible Church, which admits of indifferent Christians; They leave them in the same polluted State of Nature, as the Children of *Turks* and *Infidels*: They make the Dispensation under the Law,

H

to

170 *A Vindication of Infant-Baptism,*

to be more favourable than that of the Gospel: They make the *Jews*, who believed in Christ, to be great Losers by his Coming: They would have God to disown his Creatures, before they have forsaken or offended him, and punish them for the Sins of others: Their Doctrine tends to persuade us, that God hath broken his Covenant with our Children, and is more inclinable to Severity to them, than Mercy: They lessen the free Grace of the Gospel, and deny their Children the Mercies Christ hath purchased for them: They play the Devil's part, in accusing their Children, and in disputing them out of the Church, out of the Covenant, and Promises of God annex'd to it.

These are the Effects and Consequences of this pernicious Doctrine of the *Anabaptists*, That Infants are not to be Baptized. Mr. *Baxter* proves that they are:

First, By Christ's Commission deliver'd to his Apostles, to *go and Disciple all Nations*, &c. wherein Infants are included; which Argument we have already examin'd. And it plainly appears, that the Holy Ghost names some Infants *Disciples*, *Acts* 15. 10. If so, they are to be admitted to the Privilege of Christ's Disciples, which is Baptism, as we have already observed.

Secondly, All that are capable of being Servants of God, are capable of being Disciples: Now Infants are capable of being
God's

God's Servants; they are so named, *Levit.* 25. 41, 42. there the *Israelites* are commanded, in the Day of *Jubile*, to let their Brother that was sold to them, and his Children, to be set at liberty; because God declares them to be his Servants. Children are here included, and stiled God's Servants, tho' they were so young, that they could do him no service; yet, if God owns them to be his Disciples and Servants, we have no reason to deny them that Honour, nor the Privileges that belong to that Relation.

Thirdly, If Infants are capable to be Subjects of Christ's Kingdom, they are capable to be his Disciples; but they are capable of the one, as Christ saith, therefore of the other. Christ's Visible Church is nam'd his Kingdom, or his School; therefore every Member of it is under him, and related to him, as a King, or a Prophet. Now Children are declared to be fit for his Kingdom, as Subjects of it; therefore they ought to be enter'd into it by the means appointed, that is, by Baptism.

Fourthly, If all such as are capable to be Church-Members and Christians, are to be Baptized, as it is plain by Christ's express Order. And all Infants of Believers are reckon'd of that Number, *for of such is the Kingdom of God*, that is fit and capable of being Subjects of Christ's Kingdom, and Members of his Church, and Christians;

172 *A Vindication of Infant-Baptism,*

Therefore Infants are consequently to be baptized at their first Admission.

Fifthly, St. Paul saith, Eph. 5. 26. That Christ sanctifieth and cleanseth his Church by the washing of Water through the Word. If Christ's whole Church is to be thus sanctified and cleansed by the washing of Water and the Word, then Children of Believers, who are to belong to Christ's Church, must be so sanctified and cleansed, by this washing of Water, or Baptism, and by the Word of God, or the Word of Promises, annex'd to the Ordinance, and applied to the Party Baptized by the Minister in Christ's name, and by the Efficacy of the Holy Spirit, the Spirit of Sanctification.

Sixthly, If by the Mercy and Appointment of God not yet repealed, some Infants were to be Members of his Visible Church, and enter'd into his Covenant, then some Infants are to be admitted still: His Mercy and Inclination to them being as great as ever, and they as capable of it under the Gospel, as under the Law, and no greater Impediment appearing on either side. If this be granted, which cannot reasonably be denied but by Ignorance, or Obstinacy, we must from hence infer, that they are now to be admitted by that Ordinance, that Christ hath appointed for that purpose, as they were to be admitted then by that Method, which was then in use by the same Authority. Does not this

rea-

reasoning conclude that our Infants are necessarily to be admitted into his Church and Covenant, by Baptism? And tho' the *Jewish* Church-Constitution was abolish'd, the State of Believers and of their Children was the same; the Mercy and Goodness of God is as favourable to us, and ours, as ever he was to them: Therefore the Objection that implies the contrary is vain, frivolous, and of no weight in our case. Again, Before the *Jewish* Church was establish'd, Infants were received into Covenant with God, by his express Order; therefore this Order was no part of the Levitical or Ceremonial Law of *Moses*, that was to be abolish'd by our Redeemer, tho' the particular Sign and Seal was made a part of that Law, and appropriated to it, as an Obligation on the *Israelites*, to observe the Contents of that Law. And as that gracious and general Order, that tends to enter our Children at Eight Days old, was never repealed by God, we are to judge, that it continues still in force under the Gospel; therefore as Children were then enrolled by Circumcision, we have Christ's warrant for the same Reason, to admit our Infants by Baptism, the outward distinguishing Sign and Seal of our Profession.

Seventhly, But to yield a little to our Adversaries, suppose God should have abolish'd this Order, and does not allow that Children should be brought into Covenant with him

174 *A Vindication of Infant-Baptism,*

under the Gospel, till they can make Profession of their Faith, as they declare: This *Alteration* is from a Motive of Mercy or Justice, either for their good or for their hurt; but neither of these can reasonably be imagin'd to be the Causes of their *Exclusion*: Not Mercy, for the merciful Nature of God never revokes a Mercy, but grants a greater in lieu of it: Neither can it be a Mercy to deprive our Infants of so great a Mercy, as such an intimate Relation to him, as is procured in Baptism: Nor can Justice be the Motive of this change, for God never exercises his Justice, but with those who first break Covenant with him. And is it probable that he should admit the Children of the former Dispensation into Covenant with him, and offer under a more favourable Dispensation, to excommunicate our Babes, as unfit and unworthy of his favour to the *Jewish*? Or can this *Excommunication* be interpreted as a Mercy to them, to be out of the Church, and out of the Covenant with God, in the polluted State of Nature? Such as are receiv'd within, have God engaged in an Oath or Promise, to be their God. And is it a Mercy to your Children, *Blind Leaders of the Blind*! to deprive your Infants of this gracious Promise, of which they can have no Assurance, and to which they can have no right nor

appa.

apparent Title, without Baptism, this Seal of the Gospel Covenant?

Eighthly, If the Church of Christ be not in a worse State now, in regard of their Childrens happiness, and their Parents comfort therein, than it was before Christ's coming, then our Children ought to be Church Members. But certainly the Christian Church is not in a worse condition than the Jewish was formerly, in this respect, and in all others, as may be proved from *Heb. 8. 6. Jesus is the Mediator of a better Covenant, established upon better Promises. Heb. 7. 22. He is the Author of a better Testament. Rom. 5. 14, 15, 20. Where Sin abounded, Grace much more abounded. And Eph. 3. 19. The Love of Christ passeth Knowledge.* Don't all these and many other Texts declare our condition far better under the Gospel, than the Jewish was under the Law? Have not we a better Covenant, better Promises, a far better and a more merciful Mediator? And all these Gospel Advantages, Are they to belong to us, and not to our Children? Are those innocent Babes only to be deprived of these excellent Benefits? Are they to be treated with more severity than formerly, by so Merciful a Redeemer? Unless we imagine God's Mercies to be greater without his Church than within, certainly the Infants of believing Christians excluded from the Covenant, are

176 *A Vindication of Infant-Baptism,*
in a worse condition, than were the Children
of believing *Jews*.

Ninthly, If Children of Believers be now
put out of the Church by God's Appoint-
ment, they are in a worse Condition than
the Children of the *Gentiles* were before the
coming of Christ; but that were most ab-
surd and false, so is the Antecedent. If this
were true, the conclusion would necessarily
follow: For, before Christ's coming, any
Gentile profelyted to the *Jewish* Religion,
might have his Children, at Eight Days old,
be received Members of God's Visible
Church; therefore if our Infants cannot
have the same Privilege, they are in a worse
condition than those were in. And is it
probable, that Christ came to destroy, or
deprive those tender Souls, for whom he
expresseth so great a Kindness and Love,
as to hinder them of those Advantages,
that they enjoy'd so long before the *Jewish*
Oeconomy? Certainly the Design of Christ
in the Gospel, is not to abridge, but to
inlarge our Privileges, and the Privileges
of our Children, and to grant us at least
as great. or greater Assurances of our and
their Salvation.

Tenthly, If the Covenant that God made
with the *Jews* and their little Ones, and
with their Posterity after them, in *Deut.*
29. 10, 11, 12. was a Covenant of Grace,
or a Gospel Covenant, then it is not re-
pealed, consequently their Church-Member-
ship

ship is not repealed, being built on the Covenant. Now that was a Covenant of Grace, or a Gospel Covenant into which Infants were enter'd then, as I shall make it appear ; therefore their Church-Membership, that this Covenant supposeth, is not repealed. *All the Men of Israel that stood before the Lord, their little Ones, their Wives, and the Stranger that was in the Camp, did then enter into Covenant with the Lord their God, and into the Oath which the Lord their God made with them that Day, that he might establish them that Day, for a People unto himself, and that he might be to them a God.* Take notice that the Covenant was made with their little Ones ; and, That this Covenant was a Covenant of Grace, or a Gospel Covenant ; for that Covenant that promiseth to Circumcise the Heart, and the Heart of their Seed, to love the Lord God with all their Heart, and with all their Soul, that they might live, must needs be a Covenant of Grace ; but this is promised, *Deut. 30. 6.* and such a Covenant is a Covenant of Grace, the Author to the Hebrews proves it, *Heb. 10. 16, 17; I will put my Laws into their Hearts, and in their Minds will I write them.* St. Paul expresses it more plainly, *Rom. 10. 5, 6, 7, 8, 9. The Word is nigh thee, even in thy Mouth, and in thy Heart, that is, the Word of Faith which we preach.* Now the Apostle relates at large these Verses of the Tenth of the

178 *A Vindication of Infant-Baptism,*

Romans, out of this Covenant of *Deuteronomy*, made with the Infants, which by *St. Paul's* Application shews sufficiently, that this was a Covenant of Grace, or a Gospel Covenant, out of which our Infants are not to be excluded, and which was never repealed in relation to them; if it was, let our Adversaries prove it.

Eleventhly, If God by his unchangeable Law and Promise, hath declar'd the Seed of the Righteous to be Blessed under the Gospel, as well as under the Law, as *Psal.* 37. 26. then certainly they are to be Members of his Visible Church; for God never pronounced any other Society Blessed besides, or out of his Church. This is an unchangeable Promise, relating to all Ages, and to the Righteous for ever, and to their Seed; and not to the *Jews* only, but to Christians and their Infants, who are therefore to be admitted into the Church of God, that they might be capable of this Blessing design'd for them in that Text.

Twelfthly, That Doctrine that maketh Infants to be Members of the Visible Kingdom of the Devil, is a false, and an abominable Doctrine; but that Doctrine, which denieth Infants to be Members of the Visible Church of Christ, doth make them Members of the Visible Kingdom of the Devil; therefore 'tis a false and abominable Doctrine. We may safely charge this Doctrine with the consequence; for there

is no Third State. Whosoever is not belonging to Christ's Visible Kingdom, is yet in the World, and under the Prince of this World, or the God of this World, 2 Cor. 4. 4. without God, and Christ, a Child of Wrath, &c. And tho' we are not to think all unbaptized Persons to belong to the Kingdom of Satan, yet the Doctrine that excludes them out of Christ's Church and Covenant, tends to make them Members of the Devil's Kingdom and Empire, if not really, at least doctrinally: For as the Church of Christ is a People called out of the World, *John* 15. 19. chosen and separated by some distinguishing Sign or Institution by our Saviour's Appointment; Whosoever refuseth to any, this distinguishing Sign of his Profession, that is capable of it, or invited to it, shuts them out of Christ's Visible Church, and as much as in them lies, condemns them to continue in the Kingdom of the God of this World, the Devil: For 'tis plain, that whosoever is not admitted into Christ's Kingdom, is without it, *Colos.* 4. 5. *1 Thess.* 4. 12. and there is no admission but by Baptism. Now Infants are either within, or without, they cannot be within, without a Reception; therefore they are without, and yet belonging to the World, of which Christ saith, that the Devil is the Prince, *John* 12. 31. and *John* 14. 30. What a pernicious Doctrine is this; And how blinded and inhumane must

180 *A Vindication of Infant-Baptism,*
must Parents be to their new-born Babes, to leave them long in such a State? And how uncomfortable a consideration is it, to see them depart out of the World in that condition, out of Christ and his Visible Church?

Thirteenthly, That Doctrine which affords us no apparent nor sound Hope of the Justification or Salvation of any dying Infants, is undoubtedly false Doctrine; but that Doctrine that denieth Infants to be Members of the Visible Church of Christ, and excludes them out of it, affords us no apparent nor sound Hope of the Justification or Salvation of any dying Infants; therefore 'tis undoubtedly false Doctrine. The Major is plain; for as sound Hope is guided by Judgment, which ought to have some evidence or proof to depend on; where there is no seeming nor visibility, there can be no Evidence; therefore there can be no Judgment, and consequently no sound nor apparent Hope in this case. The Minor is as undoubted: That they that are not seemingly of the Church, are not seemingly or visibly in a State of Salvation; the Holy Scripture declares it, for Christ came to redeem his Church, and those are only to be saved, whom the Father hath given him, who belong to this Church, chosen in him before the Foundation of the World, predestinated to the adoption of Children by Jesus Christ, who are redeemed by his Blood,
and

and receive the Forgiveness of Sins, &c. And as those who belong not to Christ's Church and Kingdom, cannot expect these Advantages, there is no apparent nor sound Hope of their Salvation : Neither is any Promise in God's Word to give us any ground to hope or believe any such thing ; but on the contrary, Such as were to be saved, the Lord added to the Church, *Acts 2. 47.* If our Adversaries did seriously consider in what danger they cast their Children, in relation to their eternal Welfare, by denying to them Baptism, the Entrance into Christ's Visible Church on Earth, they would doubtless alter their Perswasion, if they are moved with any Sentiments of Love and Affection for them. As we have no certainty of the Salvation of such as are excluded out of Christ's Church, we have on the contrary the greatest Assurance for them who belong to this Church ; for *Christ is the Saviour of the Body*, and he will *sanctify and cleanse his Church, and present it unspotted to the Father.* The Promises of God are fuller, to the Members of his Visible Church, of Mercy and Pardon of Grace, Protection and Salvation ; God is engaged by Covenant more to them than to others, and they are God's Heritage ; And is it not a Madness in our Adversaries, to deprive their own Children of all the Blessings and Advantages promised to Christ's Church and People, by refusing them Baptism ?

182 *A Vindication of Infant-Baptism,*

Fourteenthly, If an Infant was the Head of the Visible Church, then Infants may be Members; but Christ, an Infant, was the Head of the Church, therefore Infants may be Members. That Christ in his Infancy, according to his Humane Nature, was the Head of his Church, the Vision of Angels proclaim him to the Shepherds, and the Adoration of the Wise Men, witness him to be the Saviour Christ, the Lord and Head of his Church; therefore consequently Infants may be with more reason Members of it. Therefore *Irenaeus*, who lived near the Apostles Time, has these Expressions, *Christ went through every Age, and for Infants he was made an Infant, sanctifying Infants, in little Children, he being a little Child, sanctifying them, that have this very Age, and withal being made unto them an Example of Piety, and Righteousness, and Subjection.* Is not here a clear Proof from Antiquity of Infants-Baptism or Church-Membership? For if they are sanctified by Christ, and he himself became an Infant to sanctify Infants, then doubtless they are Church-Members; which cannot be without Baptism.

Fifteenthly, In *Mark 9. 36.* 'Tis said, that Christ took a Child, and set him in the midst of them, and when he had taken him in his Arms, he said unto them, *Whosoever shall receive one of such Children in my Name, receiveth me; and whosoever shall receive me, receiveth not me, but him that sent me.*

Doth

Doth Christ take them up in his Arms ?
And would he have us reject them, and
shut them out of his Church ? Can they
be received in his Name by such as ex-
communicate them, and deny them to be
his Disciples ? Does Christ account the re-
ceiving of them, to be the receiving of
himself and God the Father, and shall
we refuse them to be Subjects of his Visi-
ble Kingdom ? May we not inferr from
hence, that he that will not receive them,
refuseth to receive Christ ? Since there-
fore this is the revealed Will of our Blef-
sed Redeemer, and that we are all to be
governed only by this revealed Will, as
our Adversaries pretend ; we judge it an
heinous Crime, an horrid Impiety, a
Condemnation of Christ's Wisdom, Mer-
cy and Order, and a grievous Unjustice
and Impiety, to reject Children, and to
refuse them an Entrance into his Visible
Church by Baptism.

Some

*Some Remarks on Mr. Stennet's Answer
to Mr. Ruffen's Book against the Ana-
baptists.*

I Design not to justify Mr. *Ruffen* in all that he says, but only to vindicate the Truth, Doctrines, and Practices of the Church of *England*, in relation to Infant Baptism, against the plausible, but deceitful Arguments of his Answerer. He takes all occasions to ridicule the Author, who gives him frequent opportunities to play upon him, to the apparent prejudice of the cause he maintains. Mr. *Stennet* first discants, or rather drolls upon the Title, *Fundamentals without Foundation*. He might have understood Mr. *Ruffen's* meaning, That the *Fundamentals* of the *Anabaptists*, of their *Heresy* and *Schism*, have no Foundation either in Holy Scripture or Reason: This will appear to the Reader, by the perusal of the Second Antidote. For the rise of this Sect, Mr. R— is not much mistaken. 'Tis not yet Two Hundred Years ago that it first appear'd; and for its Progress and Practice, is not so innocent as Mr. *Stennet* would persuade the World; but the Danger and Wickedness of this persuasion, with the pernicious Consequences, may be clearly discovered by the evidence that I have brought, and shall bring for that purpose.

purpose. Truly Mr. *Russen* had cause, as we have all, to lament at the increase of this Heretical Sect, so destructive to the Souls of Infants, to the Peace of the Church and private Families, and to the disgrace of Christianity. Mr. *Stennet* has no reason to compare his innovations and unwarrantable Principles with the Divine Doctrines publish'd by our Saviour: The latter proceeds from God, whom we are bound to obey; but the former have the Devil, the Grand deceiver, for their Author, who makes use of the same Artifice as in the beginning, by working upon the Minds, and deluding the Weaker Sect, that they might insinuate and draw into his Snares, others not well settled in Religion. For this Subtil Tempter of Mankind knows how and where to lay his baits, of what Metal we are made, and who are most likely to promote his Empire, being well acquainted with our Inclination and Dispositions; but the contents of Mr. *Stennet's* whole Book may be reduced to these *Six Heads*. First, That there is no Divine Institution for the Baptism of Infants. His meaning is, That Infants belong not to the Divine Institution of Baptism. But I have proved the contrary, by the Command and Invitation of Christ, to *suffer little Children to come to him, &c.* and by the reason that he gives, because his Kingdom, or his Church, where he reigns, belongs to them, into which they cannot be

186 *A Vindication of Infant-Baptism,*

be enter'd but by Baptism. And 'tis observable, how gracious God is to Children under the Gospel, more than before, and under the Law; in that then none but Male Children were by Circumcision to be introduc'd into Covenant with him, and upon their account and submission to this Ordinance, God promised to be the God of the Seed of *Abraham* without exception; the other Sex indeed were Profelyted by Baptism; but under the Gospel both Sexes are ordered to be initiated into Covenant with him, for our Saviour makes no distinction, but appoints sucking Babes of either Sex to be brought to him, and inroll'd into his Church by Baptism. I appeal to the judicious Reader whether I have not sufficiently vindicated this Doctrine of our Church, by divers Texts and Arguments out of the Word of God, and the universal consent and practice of the first and present Ages. That Children of Believing Parents are to be Baptized by Christ's exprefs Command. Therefore Mr. *Stennet's* frequent suppositions in this are false and erroneous.

Secondly, He affirms, that Infants are no Disciples, and cannot be so nominated till they are capable of institution, or till they have been taught. This likewise I have proved to be false, if God's Holy Word be true, *Acts* 15. 10. where Infants at Three Days Old are nam'd Disciples, as I have made it appear. Mr. *Stennet* opposes this

Truth

Truth with Six Reasons, That none can be made Disciples without being first taught. But as in our Schools, some may be enter'd Disciples and Scholars, when they are design'd to be taught by a Master, and from that time they are reckon'd as his Scholars; so Infants may be Christ's Disciples, from their first admission into his Church by Baptism. For his five other Reasons, they are very weak: What belongs to the Adult in Holy Scripture, he applies to the case of Infants, who were never treated alike under the Law with Persons of years and discretion, nor the same acts required from them as from the others, for the obtaining Church and Covenant Privileges: Therefore Mr. *Sten-*ner's Arguments and Allegations are frivolous and vain.

Thirdly, He would have Dipping to be the only and proper mode of Baptism; for he declares, that the original word Baptize, signifies only to dip or plunge, and not to sprinkle; but this assertion I have prov'd to be false, both by the Word of God and Greek Authors, where *Canizōn* is often used for sprinkling, and cannot be sometimes understood for dipping, immersion or plunging.

Fourthly, That it was our Saviour's Institution, confirm'd by his own practice, and that of St. *John*, of the Holy Apostles and of the primitive Ages, to Baptize always by immersion. But this we deny, and cannot be

be proved from the Word of God nor ancient Authors. In all the *Bible* I can find but one Text where Interpreters render the word Baptize by dipping, and in that have taken notice, that the Spirit of God in the former Verses, calls it Three times washing, *2 Kings* 5. Mr. Stennet cannot prove that Christ instituted the Sacrament of Baptism to be administered by Dipping unless the word Baptize did always signify Immersion, which it does not, whatever his *Scapula's* and Lexicons (upon which his faith and perswasion wholly depends) says to the contrary, as I have made it appear; and demonstrated that this word βαπτίζω is frequently employ'd by the Evangelists for sprinkling and washing, where 'tis unreasonable to imagine any dipping, and that St. Paul names the Sprinklings of the Levitical Law, *Baptisms*, *Heb.* 9. 10. Therefore his assertion is false, and of a dangerous consequence, tending to the subversion of all Christianity amongst us, and all Protestant Nations.

Fifthly, That sprinkling or pouring of Water upon the Face is no Baptism, and that this Sacrament cannot be duly administered without dipping or a total immersion of the whole Body in Water, are pernicious Errors, becoming the Charity of that Sect that pleads so much for the practice of that Vertue from others, in relation to themselves; yet by their Doctrine are so uncharitable

uncharitable, that they will have none to be Christians, or in a way to Salvation, besides themselves. Will Mr. Stennet impose upon us his false Conjectures and Suppositions, and mistaken Interpretations, as undeniable proofs for Dipping and Immersion? I must here retort upon him his own saying, p. 30. with a little Alteration: So weighty a matter as a due Administration of an Ordinance of Christ, ought to be better founded, than on a meer Conjecture of the Prejudiced *Anabaptists*; and the controlling of the Churches of Christ, Govern'd by the Spirit of God, in a matter of that concern, ought to be warranted by undeniable evidences from his Blessed Word; and a plain proof in the Holy Scripture, for Dipping and Immersion of the whole Body over Head and Ears in Water, may be reasonably demanded of those, who plead for the practice of it; and a clear precedent for it, is the least thing that can be required in this case.

Sixthly, That in the first Ages of Christianity, Children were not admitted to Baptism; and that the Baptism of Infants began in the Third Century, is false, as we have already prov'd from the ancient Records. But is it not strange, that after the peaceable possession of a Right and Title during above Fifteen Hundred years, according to our computation, and according to theirs Thirteen Hundred, without any

any controul, but from avowed Hereticks, a new Sect should arise, and dispute our Children out of that privilege, they have enjoyed so long. If an Heir to an Estate in Land had been dispossessed of his freehold, descended to him from his forefathers thro' so many Ages, he wou'd think himself very much wrong'd, and upon such slender, weak and unsufficient evidences, as our Adversaries produce against our belief and practice. It was a Custom amongst the *Spartans*, and a Law, that none should offer to abolish or plead for the altering any common practice or ordinance, but should come with an Halter about his Neck, that if his motion in the assembly had been unjust and unreasonable, he might be immediately Hang'd, to vindicate the Equity of that Law, by the Punishment of the Opposer. If such a Practice had been amongst us in these latter days of Error and Schism, we should not have now so much cause as we have to lament at the unjust and damnable Innovations amongst our People, in relation to Religion; and Division would not have been so much countenanced as it is, to the destruction of so many Souls, and the contempt of Piety and the Worship of God.

The Reasonings and Arguments, and drolling of Mr. *Stennet*, in his Answer to Mr. *Russen*, are grounded and depend upon the forenamed false suppositions, which he

often

often repeats and delivers for undeniable Truths, and with which he insults and triumphs over his Adversary. Now I am concern'd to reply to his evasions, by which he would perswade us, that the promise mention'd by *St. Peter, Acts 2. 39.* to the *Jews*, can give no countenance to infant Baptism. He says, *I know not how the Citation of this Text can answer his end, unless he can prove this to be a promise of Baptism, or at least of somewhat that gives an immediate right to it.* Mr. Stennet mistakes *St. Peter* and the Text. 'Tis no promise to Baptism, but the promise of the remission of Sins, consequential to Baptism; a promise as ancient as *Abraham, I will be thy God, and of thy Seed after thee*; which promise concludes God's favour and the remission of Sin, which was obtainable in Baptism, by what *St. Peter* told his Countrymen; That this promise is of the Holy Spirit mention'd in *Joel*, on the Miraculous effusion of the Holy Ghost and of Tongues, unreasonable to think; for Children are not capable of such supernatural Gifts. But that the promise is of the Holy Spirit, I confess; for no Benefits nor Blessings can be expected in Baptism, but from the mercy and efficacy of God's Holy Spirit, which supposes our obedience and presentation of Children. That the promise is annex'd to Repentance and Baptism in relation to the Adult *Jews*, is not question'd, because

192 *A Vindication of Infant-Baptism,*

because they were concerned in the Crucifying of Christ, and without Repentance, 'twas unreasonable to Baptize them in his Blessed Name ; nor could they expect the Remission of their Sins without it. But from their innocent Children, who had not been stained with that Sacred Blood, there was no just cause to require Repentance, but only that they should be Baptized, to be enter'd into the same Covenant of Grace with their Parents, for the procuring to them the benefits there offer'd. That Children and Infants are here to be understood, is plain, for there is no exception of any. And if Mr. Stennet will have the word Children to be taken for Posterity, I hope that word comprehends their Children that were then born, as well as those that were not. Therefore here he seems to contradict himself twice, in allowing the promise to be made to their Posterity, but not to their Children, tho' that word signifies all their Children, born and unborn, and the Succeeding Generations. And 'tis very unreasonable to think, that the promise of Remission of Sins, or any other promise, should belong to their Posterity, and that their Children then in being should have no right to it ; as if God were more gracious and favourable to those that were not, than to those that were in being. So when I compare his first evasion, where he saith, *This promise is of the Holy Spirit spoken of, v. 33. with*

his 4th, where he acknowledges this Promise to be annex'd to Repentance and Baptism, which was of the Remission of Sins. I meet with another contradiction that this Judicious and Learned Man is guilty of; and he insists upon this latter Exposition, and strains his Wit and Reason, to shew how incapable Infants are of this promise, because they are not able to perform the condition of that promise; I have already answered to this frivolous objection in divers places: They perform the Conditions by their Sureties, who promise for them; which promise when they come to Age, themselves are bound to perform. Again, 'tis unreasonable to suppose Repentance needful in Infants, who have no other guilt but of original Sin. Neither is in them any thing contrary to that Qualification and Disposition requisite in the Adult, to intitle them to Baptism. Therefore this reasoning of Mr. Stennet's is very weak and improper. *Why may not the Adult also expect for themselves the accomplishment of the same promise, without fulfilling the condition of it?* I appeal to his own Judgment whether his Question be rational; 'tis as if he should say, Why may not a Jew, a Turk, or other Infidel, while he Blasphemes Christ, Adores his *Maomet* for his Prophet, Worships his false Gods, and all that deny Christ, be admitted into his Church by Baptism, while they continue in their Infidelity, as well as the

Children of Believing Parents, who are resolv'd to train them up in his Holy Profession? Is this a Reasoning becoming so Sublime an Understanding as that of Mr. *Stennet*? And tho' Promises and Commands were given to the Children of *Israel*, which were not to be performed by them in the State of Infancy, What is that to our purpose here? Do such Promises and Commands disannul God's promise of being the God of our Children, of granting to them the Pardon of their Sins, and of Divine Favour and Mercy so young? All which is to be obtain'd and promised to them in this Ordinance of Baptism.

That the Faith and Profession of Christianity of Parents and other Friends, entitles their Infants to Baptism, I have already proved by *St. Paul's* styling them Holy. Mr. *Stennet* need not call for a proof of this Truth, if he wou'd mind how the Faith of a certain Father, who had but a small measure of it, clouded by unbelief, which occasion'd this complaint, *Lord I believe, help thou my unbelief*, obtain'd for his Son a perfect Cure, in a Miraculous manner by the Mercy and Power of Christ. And why may not the Faith of Parents be as beneficial to them, and powerful with our good God, to procure to them Spiritual Mercies, as it was to draw upon this Child a Temporal One, when they dedicate them to his Honour and Service in Baptism,

and

and enter them thereby into his Holy Profession and Covenant? If Mr. Stennet enquires what Covenant I mean, 'tis the Covenant of Grace, or of the Gospel, into which Men and Children are visibly admitted by Baptism. Belief is a Qualification needful in Men, for their admittance to that Ordinance; but Infants are to be receiv'd into it, tho' they cannot actually believe, through the Mercy of God, that Indulges their weakness and incapacities, and without any mention of Faith or Repentance from them promises in this Covenant, *To be merciful to their Unrighteousness, and their Sins and Iniquities will I Remember no more, Heb. 8.*
12.

Mr. Stennet questions next, What right the Infants of vicious Parents, who are no better than Pagans, Jews, and Mahometans, have to Baptism? I answer, the same right they have to Baptism as the Infants of debauch'd Jews, of Publicans and Sinners had to Circumcision. Tho' their Parents are vicious, the Children are like to be brought up in the knowledge of Christianity, and may perhaps take another Course of Living. The sinful lives or practical unbelief of their Parents ought not to prejudice their right and claim to Baptism and the Covenant, being born of outward Professors, who are within the Pale of the Church; and there is no manner of Comparison between them and the Children of Infidels, who are to be
I 2 tutored

196 *A Vindication of Infant-Baptism,*
tutored in their enmity to Christ and his Profession. Our Children have therefore a birth-right to be enter'd into Covenant with God, and to be admitted to the outward Seal of it, which is Baptism. But as to the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper, they are not qualified for that until they come to years of Discretion, for the reasons I have already mention'd. As to the following Paragraphs, that deny Aspersions to be a lawful mode of Baptism, and Infants to be no proper Subjects of it, I have sufficiently proved the contrary already. And for Mr. *Russen's* indelible Character imprinted at Baptism, I cannot be of his judgment; and for other matters, till the end of Mr. *Stennet's* Second Chapter, I have either answered them, or they deserve not any notice to be taken of them, in relation to the cause that I maintain.

In his Third Chapter, which first treats of the names given to this Sect by Mr. *Russen* and others, Mr. *Stennet* esteems the Name of *Anabaptists* to be wrongfully bestowed upon them; for he looks upon the Baptism of our Church to be null and void, and terms it an Humane Ceremony of giving a Name, p. 51. and judges Christning to be a Profanation of the Sacred Name of Christ; but how unjustly and wrongfully he abuses our Church and Ministry, and this Ordinance of Christ administred by us his Lawful Ministers and Stewards, let the

the Reader judge from the Premises. Amongst the divers *Seēts* mention'd by Mr. *Russen*, are the *Hemerobaptists*, which were a *Seēt* of the *Jews*, before the coming of Christ, imitated by the late *Seēt* of the *Anabaptists*, as some affirm, in their daily Washings or Dipping themselves. But how this and other Names given to other Heretical *Seēts* of Antiquity, who never denied Baptism to Infants, can prove this present *Seēt* of the *Anabaptists*, to be of an older Date than 1521 or 1522, I understand not.

Therefore the ancient *Apostolici*, *Cathari*, *Adamites*, *Silentes*, *Enthusiasts*, &c. who were not unknown to St. *Augustine*, were no *Anabaptists*, or of the same Perswasion in this Case with those, whom Mr. *Russen* calls by those Names from *Alstedius's Ind. Theol. Polem.* for that Orthodox Father affirms, that he never knew, nor heard of any *Seēt*, that were so impious as to deny Baptism to Infants. Therefore Mr. *Russen* is not mistaken when he affirms, That Infant Baptism has been the constant Opinion and Practice of the Universal Church, both Primitive and Modern, and only denied by the *Antipædobaptists* of these Two last Centuries, contrary to the Example, Faith, and Practice of the Universal or Catholick Church. What Proofs we have from Holy Scripture for Infant Baptism, I have already set down, and what Evidences we have from human Testimonies, to witness this to have been

198 *A Vindication of Infant-Baptism,*

the Doctrine and Practice of the first Ages, next to the Apostles, let *Origen, Irenaus, Justin Martyr* and others, formerly mention'd, declare. Therefore Mr. *Stenner's* saying, *That Infant Baptism began to creep into the Church in Tertullian's Time*, is not true; for it was the constant Practice of Christians before, as we have made it appear. And is it probable, if it had then begun, that *Tertullian*, who dissuades from it, would not have declar'd it to be an Innovation in the Church, to strengthen his Opinion, and to discourage the constant Usage. *Cyprian's* Testimony, which is undeniable for Infant Baptism, he despises, because of the weak Arguments he uses to perswade it to *Fidus* before Eight Days old; but *Cyprian, Irenaus, Tertullian* and the rest, writ according to the Humour and Capacity of their Age, and neither of them seem to be great Logicians. Therefore to cavil at the weakness of *Cyprian's* reasoning, is impertinent to our purpose, and cannot disprove his Evidence for Infant-Baptism, to have been then the undoubted and unquestionable Practice of the Churches of God. He must needs be at that Time about Fifty Years old; And is it likely, that about one Hundred Years after the decease of *St. John*, the last surviving Apostle of Christ, *Cyprian* should be ignorant of the Apostolick Doctrines and Practices in this Case?

For *Rigaltius's* Annotations upon *St. Cyprian*, I have this to say, That he is a very bad Commentator, to act the Part of a Censurer, instead of explaining the Author's meaning. But as *Mr. St.* speaks of Martyrs and Confessors, *Page 123.* *He is no Rule to us, unless we could be sure he were infallible; we shall not be secure in following his Judgment, any further than he follows Christ and his Apostles.* And as there are divers Mistakes of his, in relation to the Word of God in that Quotation, we have reason to reject him as erroneous. *Mr. St.* would perswade the World, That this Custom first took its Rise from a Mis-interpretation of those Words of our Saviour, *Except a Man be born of Water, &c. John 3. 5.* From whence some concluded Salvation not attainable without Baptism, &c. Does *Mr. Stennet* imagine that his vain and groundless Fancies will pass for current Truths? He calls our, and the Universal Churches Exposition of this Text, a Mis-interpretation; but I have proved it to be Orthodox, and agreeable with *Christ's* purpose, in his Answer to *Nicodemus*, in my reply to *Mr. Charnock's* simple Exposition of the Words, which I find *Mr. St.* follows. He seems to deny, to be born of Water to signify external Washing, and yet confirms it by that Text he brings, *Tit. 3. 5.* What false Glosses and Interpretations do our Adversaries give to God's Holy Word, to establish their abominable Errors? Here are

200. *A Vindication of Infant-Baptism,*

Two Passages that expressly declare the necessity of Infant-Baptism in order to Salvation, in the ordinary Method and Course of Divine Grace ; that of St. John, *Except a Person be born of Water, and the Spirit, he cannot enter into the Kingdom of God.* Christ requires Two things from Nicodemus, to enter into God's Kingdom, but Mr. St. says there is but One. No Wonder if he contradicts us sinful Men, since he dares contradict our infallible Redeemer, in so plain and intelligible a Text ; but says he, *Water and the Spirit, is the Water of the Spirit, or Spiritual Water.* Mr. St. must be gifted with that warm Brain he mentions, p. 70. to argue as he does. If Men will give themselves the Liberty, thus to pervert and abuse the Scripture, there is no Text, never so clear, but may be thus abused and darken'd to the Understandings of the Hearers. That our Saviour understands the Baptism of Water, the Baptism of John ; without which, this Pharisee could not enter, nor be received into the Kingdom of the Messiah ; and the Birth of the Spirit, the inward Operation of the Holy Ghost in the Soul, is a certain Truth ; for both Conditions being necessarily required in the Subjects of that Kingdom, an outward Profession, or a Submission to the Ordinances of God, and an inward Sanctification of the Mind, to render them capable of it, or well qualified for it : Therefore St. Peter exhorts the first converted

Jews

Jews to be baptized; and after *Cornelius* and his Company had received the Gifts of the Holy Ghost, yet Baptism of Water was thought required, to observe the Orders of that Kingdom. If Christ's Meaning had been altogether Spiritual, Why does Christ tell him, that he spoke to him of earthly things? v. 12. What other earthly thing was there in this Discourse of our Saviour, besides to be Born, or Regenerated of Water? In all the Subjects of his Kingdom, does not he require an outward Profession, as well as an inward Qualification? And is not the first Step into it Baptism? Mr. St. by his false Gloss declares the Baptism of Water to be needless in the Church; which is the *Quakers* Opinion: For if only a Spiritual Birth was necessary, to enter into Christ's Kingdom, What need of the Ordinance of Baptism? Here he contradicts the Confession of his Faith, and divers Passages of his Book, where he declares for the Usefulness of outward Baptism, by supposing but one thing needful to enter into Christ's Kingdom, and really to belong to it. Again, Christ offers to *Nicodemus* a Means to enter into his Kingdom, which by his coming to him privately in the Night, he seems to decline; not to be ashamed of Christ's Person and Profession, but publickly to own it, by a Compliance with the Ordinances of God. And the Text that Mr. St. cites, Tit. 3. 5. plainly contradicts the purpose

202. *A Vindication of Infant-Baptism,*
for which he quotes it. *St. Paul* tells us how
God saveth us, *not by Works of Righteousness,*
which we have done; but according to his
Mercy, he saved us by the washing of Regene-
ration, and renewing of the Holy Ghost. What
means he by the washing of Regeneration,
but *Christ's Birth*, or to be born of Water, or
Baptism of Water, the outward means appoint-
ed for us to practise, and submit to, and not
the inward Regeneration, which is expressed
in the next Words, by the renewing of the
Holy Ghost. How many absurd Tautolo-
gies, and insignificant Repetitions, would
our Adversaries fix upon our Saviour *Christ*
and *St. Paul*, to strengthen their Perswasion?
For 'tis certain, that the renewing of the
Holy Ghost is the internal Washing of
Regeneration that *Mr. Stennet* mentions, the
inward Renovation and Sanctification of the
Mind ascribed to, and effected in us, by the
sole Operation of the Spirit of God, who
purifies our Hearts by Faith, *Acts 15. 9.*
St. Peter speaks there of the *Gentiles*, who
had the Gifts of the Holy Ghost granted to
them, before they were born of Water;
yet this Birth, or Washing of Regeneration,
was judg'd needful, *Acts 10. 47.* *Can any*
Man forbid Water, that these should not be
baptized which have received the Holy Ghost,
as well as we? And is not this Interpreta-
tion agreeable with *St. Paul's* Saying,
Eph. 5. That Christ sanctifies and cleanseth his
Church by the Washing of Water, and the Word?

Where

Where the Apostle speaks of the outward Methods used for that purpose.

Now according to the fore-nam'd Text of the Apostle, *Tit.* 3. 5. Christ saving us by the Washing of Regeneration, and renewing of the Holy Ghost, without any previous Acts or Merits of ours, Is it not necessary that all Persons young and old, should be Partakers, and concern'd in this Washing of Regeneration, and renewing of the Holy Ghost, to attain to Salvation? The First is in our Power, the Second depends upon the Will and Grace of the Spirit of God. But we have reason to be fully perswaded, that if Adult Persons by these Means are saved, God will much rather grant his Salvation to Believers Children, who having no other Sins but Original Guilt and Pollution, they may be more readily remedied and obliterated by the same outward and inward Means, when they are presented to him in this Ordinance of Regeneration. And if we neglect what is left to us, and expected from our Obedience to perform, I know not of any other Expedient proposed by Christ to the Human Race, to obtain a Title to his Redemption, and the Salvation of Souls. Does not this Text plainly declare for the Necessity to be born of Water, as well as of the Spirit, to enter into the Kingdom of God, since Christ saves none by any other revealed Method as we understand? And what God said

204 *A Vindication of Infant-Baptism,*
unto *Abraham*, Gen. 17. 14. in relation to
Children and his Covenant, is applicable to
our Children under the Gospel Covenant,
in reference to Baptism: *The uncircumcised*
Man Child, whose Flesh of his Fore-skin is not
Circumcised, that Soul shall be cut off from his
People, he hath broken my Covenant. Where
we may observe that the Punishment for
such a Neglect, or Omission of God's Or-
dinance, falls upon the Child, tho' the Pa-
rents alone were guilty; and if he was to
be cut off from God's People on Earth, ex-
communicated out of the Church, What
hopes of such a Child dying uncircumcised,
was there of Salvation, since God inflicts
the Punishment on the Child in this Life,
and charges the Child with the Crime of
having broken his Covenant? This Case in
respect of Baptism is ours; the Parents
neglect or contempt of that Ordinance,
may prejudice and hinder their Childrens
Salvation, since none are saved without the
Washing of Regeneration, and the Renew-
ing of the Holy Ghost, or by the Birth of
Water and the Spirit, in the ordinary Way,
that Christ hath prescribed. Therefore
Ferus on Matth. 19. tells us, Juste & vere
ex Spiritu Christi. Ecclesia etiam rueros bap-
tizat. Non igitur Christianum, sed plane Hero-
dianum, vel si malis Egyptiacum est Parvulos
Populi necare: The Church also directed
by the Spirit of Christ, justly and truly
baptizeth Infants. Therefore 'tis not a
Practica

Practice becoming Christians, but more like to that of *Herod*, or rather like that of the *Egyptians*, to destroy the Children of the People. He means, by depriving them of Baptism, the Method of Salvation, appointed by God in his Church for that purpose.

Now to confirm his false Exposition, Mr. Stennet perverts another Text of Scripture, *That there is the same Reason to interpret Water and the Spirit, the Water of the Spirit or Spiritual Water in this Passage, as to understand Spirit and Fire of Matth. 3 11. to signify the Fire of the Spirit, or Spiritual Fire, in the Words of John the Baptist, when he says of Christ, He shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost, and with Fire.* How strangely do Men of corrupt Minds and Principles abuse the true sense of the Word of God? The Spirit and the Fire are Two different things understood by the *Baptist* and the *Evangelist*, as the Context plainly proves; for *John* here tells the *Jews*, That he could only administer to them the Baptism of Water, but there was one coming after him with far greater Power, Authority, and Efficacy, who should baptize them with the Holy Ghost, and with Fire. These Two Operations, or Effects of our Saviour's Power, was in relation to the Two sorts of Persons who came to *John's* Baptism, the sincere Professors, and the Hypocrites, whom Christ knew better than *John* how to distinguish: The sincere Professors he was to Baptize.

206 *A Vindication of Infant-Baptism,*

Baptize with the Holy Ghost, to sanctify and cleanse them from all Spiritual Pollution; but the Hypocrites he was to Baptize with Fire. Is not this the Exposition that the Baptist gives to his own Words in the next Verse? *Whose Fan is in his Hand, and he will thoroughly purge his Flour, and gather his Wheat into the Garner; but he will burn up the Chaff with unquenchable Fire.* I would ask Mr. Stennet, or those who give that false Gloss to the Baptist's first Words, Whether all that were to come to Christ's Baptism were to be Baptized with the same Baptism of the Holy Ghost, and with Fire? Or of Sanctification, as he understands the Words? If not, then here are Two Demonstrations of our Saviour's Power, able to discriminate between God's Elect, and the Ungodly: The one was to be cleansed by the Holy Ghost, and the other condemned to everlasting Flames. This is so natural an Interpretation of this Passage, that 'tis a Wonder how Men who profess the Knowledge of the Holy Scriptures, should mistake and err herein. And whereas Mr. St. saith, *Fire and Water are frequently used in Holy Scripture, to signify the sanctifying Operation of the Holy Spirit, in allusion to the Use of these Elements for Purification, &c.* this is not altogether true. There may be some Allusions to the purifying Virtue of Water applied to the Holy Ghost, but always with an Epithet, to signify its Spiritual Meaning, as the Living Water offer'd by Christ to the

Samaritan

Samaritan Woman; but Water alone, is never understood for any such purifying Operation, as Mr. *St.* affirms. And for Fire, 'tis never taken in a Spiritual Sense in the *Bible*, but either for the Punishment of the Wicked, and to express the Fierceness of God's Wrath kindled against them, or the Chastisements and Afflictions of his People, who are to be as Gold refin'd and tried in the Fire. Therefore to tell us that Fire alone is frequently used in Holy Scripture, to signify the sanctifying Operations of the Holy Spirit, is not true, neither can one Text be produced to prove it. I am sorry that so Ingenious and Learned a Person as Mr. *Stennet*, is guilty of so many Mis-applications of the Holy Scripture, in one single Paragraph: Where he proceeds to tell us, 'Tis certain this groundless Opinion, That none could enter into the Kingdom of Heaven without Baptism, made Infant-Baptism prevail in the World. How, dares Mr. *St.* call Christ's Declaration to *Nicodemus*, confirm'd by his usual Asseveration, *Verily, Verily*, a groundless Opinion? Christ speaks of the common Method appointed in his Church, to enter into his Kingdom: Therefore Parents had, and have now reason to believe Baptism absolutely necessary to Salvation, according to Christ's Order and Institution, with which we are to comply. He mentions next *Chrysostom*, *Cyril of Jerusalem*, and *St. Augustin*, who from this Text of *St. John* concluded the Necessity of Baptism,

208 *A Vindication of Infant-Baptism,*
Baptism to obtain Salvation. But he tells
us, *That Protestants have justly abandon'd that*
Principle, upon which the Romish Church still
builds their Infant-Baptism. But methinks
Mr. St. a Man of his Reading, should be
better acquainted with the Belief and
Doctrines of *Protestants and Romanists*, than
to tell us such a Tale. It might have been
excusable in my School-Master of *Wapping*,
who knows no difference between Teaching
and Learning, between a Schollar and his
Master; but in Mr. *Stennet*, a Judicious and
Learned Man, the Corypheus and Champion
of his Sect, should have understood, that
the *Romanists* build their Infant-Baptism, not
upon the Word of God, but upon the Tra-
dition of their Church, out of which their
Belief is, That none can be saved. 'Tis
upon this Principle, that they build the
Necessity of their Infant-Baptism. This is
intimated by the saying of the Learned
Whitaker against *Stapleton*, *De Author. S. S.*
lib. 1. cap. 9. We receive not Baptism from
the Authority of the Church, the Scripture is
abundantly sufficient, &c. Now all Protestants
have not abandon'd this Principle, the ne-
cessity of Baptism in order to Salvation, nor
this Interpretation of that Text of *St. John*
3. 5. as Mr. *Stennet* would perswade; for
our Rubrick, in the Office of Baptism, in
the Beginning, repeats the Words of Christ,
to justify the Practice of our Church, and
most of our Divines interpret them as we
do,

do, to impose upon us a necessary Submission to the Ordinances of God ; but as God is a free Agent, he may save without the outward means ; but we have no Warrant out of his Holy Word certainly to inform us, what he can, will, or may do in this Case. Neither are we to depend upon his secret Will, but upon his revealed, unto which we are bound to conform. Now his revealed Will commands us, *To suffer little Children to come unto him, and not to forbid them.* And again it tells us, *Except a Person be born of Water and the Spirit, he cannot enter into the Kingdom of God.* Can we have a more solid Foundation for our *Infant-Baptism* and Custom, than the Command and Words of Christ, who not only enjoins the Practice, but discovers the necessity of our Compliance with his Baptismal Institution, for our entrance into the Kingdom of God ? Therefore since we have such plain and intelligible Texts for *Infant-Baptism*, we cannot be mistaken.

Mr. Stennet continues to argue, from his false Supposition, *Since this Foundation or Text of Scripture, is by these allowed to be insufficient to bear the weight of Infant-Baptism, it might be worth a further Enquiry, whether this Practice is founded on any solid Foundation at all.* I fancy he understands some of our Protestant Dissenters, as Mr. Charnock and others ; but I am perswaded most of the foreign Divines have not abandon'd this Principle, witness the *Thef. Salmur. Zanchins, &c.* But can
Mr. Stennet

210 *A Vindication of Infant-Baptism,*

Mr. Stennet require a more solid Foundation than God's blessed Word, from whence we have clearly prov'd our Infant-Baptism, as he may see if he be not wilfully blind ; and we have confirm'd it by the Practices and Judgments of Christians in all Ages next to the Apostles, and by all the Churches of Christ in this present Age, there is not one but baptizes Infants.

He tells us next of various Superstitions that were invented, when Baptism began to be administred to Infants. Mr. Stennet persists in his Mistakes ; for Baptism of Infants is of a Divine Institution, as I have made it appear. And for the Sign of the Cross, which I am oblig'd to vindicate, 'tis very ancient, and so much esteem'd by the first Christian Emperor, that he bore it in his Victorious Banners. And 'tis observ'd by *Eusebius*, that those who stood under, or carried in Battle the Ensign of the Cross, were never wounded. And at the Baptism of *Constantine*, after he was regenerated by the New Birth of Baptism, he was signed with the Sign of the Cross, &c. in *Vita Const. Lib. 4. cap. 62.* 'Tis generally believed, that this Sign was used in the Apostles Days, and ever since by the Primitive Christians, as a publick and open Confession of Christ and his Profession, and a Sign of their braving the Enemies reproaches upon that account, and that they were not asham'd of the igno-

miny

miny of his Cross, but gloried in it before their Enemies.

Mr. Stennet saith well, That the Use of Sureties, as he names *God-fathers* and *God-mothers*, appear to be of no less ancient Date, than the Baptism of Infants, since we find it in the *Jewish Church* long before the Sacrament of Baptism, *Isaiah* 8. 2. They are named there *Witnesses*. And when *John the Baptist* was Circumcised, others besides his Parents presented him to that Ordinance, and were to give him a Name. And if we may believe the *Jews* Records and Rabbies, those *Witnesses* perform'd the same Office in Circumcision, as our Sureties do for our Children at Baptism. But I have already justified in my first *Antidote* this ancient and religious Custom, against the vain and frivolous Exceptions of Dissenting Adversaries: Therefore Mr. Stennet's Conceptions of the Reasons, how it came to be introduc'd into the Christian Church, and that it hath no Foundation in the Word of God, are vain, groundless and imaginary. And all the Conclusions and Arguments, that he draws from his false Suppositions, for which he hath no Evidence from any ancient Author, to disprove the Divine Institution, and reasonableness of Infant-Baptism, are likewise erroneous and false. To read Mr. Stennet's positive Assertions, That Infant-Baptism with other Rites and Ceremonies, began in the Church in the Days of *Tertullian*, which was about

212 *A Vindication of Infant-Baptism,*

about the Year of our Lord 202, one would think, that he was in being, and present at these Innovations ; But what Authority has he for such Untruths that he vouches, and offers to impose upon the credulous World ? If the Rites of Infant-Baptism, and Sureties had then first begun to be received, 'tis strange that no Author, then nor since, would be so just and kind to future Ages, to give an Account of these Novelties : 'Tis strange that all Churches, both of the *East* and *West* should agree together at the same Time, to admit these Innovations : 'Tis likewise very strange, if not incredible, that none of the Religious Bishops, and Orthodox and Holy Martyrs, should not offer to oppose such irregular Practices, so contrary, as Mr. Stennet would persuade us, to the Primitive Examples of the Apostles, of whom some were almost their immediate Successors, and therefore could not be ignorant of their Doctrines and Actions. Does *Tertullian* bring any other Reasons against Infant-Baptism, but his own Fancy, that they make too much haste ? Why does not he plead Antiquity, and the Apostolick Judgment and Practices, to dissuade the Men of his Days from Infant-Baptism, if it was then first received into the Church. Repentance and Faith are required in Adult Persons, according to the Direction of the Church of *England* : But Mr. Stennet and our Adversaries, won't repeat the Answer to the next Question, Why

re Infants Baptiz'd, when by reason of their Tender Age they cannot perform them? They promise them both by their Sureties, which promise when they come to Age, themselves are bound to perform. If they bring the Authority of the Church of England for one perswasion, why not for another? I have already discour'd about Sureties in my first Antidote, and shewn the Antiquity of that usage in the Church of Rome, mention'd before Terullian in the days of Hyginus, about A. D. 141. His Order favours not of Novelty, but seems to assure us, That it was the ancient practice both to Baptize Infants, and to present them to the Font by those Charitable Friends, whom Platina names, *Patrimus & Patrima*, and as *Fasciculi Tempor.* calls them, *Patrinus & Patrina*. Egesippus, a Famous Writer, being at Rome in the days of Anicetus Bishop of that City. affirmeth, That A. D. 159, there was an Uniformity of Doctrine and Practice in the Churches, and that in Rome there was nothing else Preached but the Purity of the Christian Faith, *Ens. 4 l. c. 21*. It seems that these two Customs of the Baptism of Infants and Sureties, had been receiv'd and establish'd in that Church some years before, if we may believe Authors; and if so, these Practices were agreeable to the Divine Law of our Lord by the Testimony of Egesippus, for he saith, *The Lord himself Preached.*

I shall

214 *A Vindication of Infant-Baptism,*

I shall not insist upon Mr. Stennet's next Paragraph, where he tells us, *That it was the general, if not the universal Practice of all Christian Churches for several Ages, to admit all who were Baptiz'd to partake of the Lord's Supper: Adult Persons I confess; but that Infants were generally and in all Churches admitted to that participation, as he would insinuate, I deny as an untruth.* Some Superstitious Persons may have practised this custom out of an high opinion of the Virtue of the Consecrated Bread and Wine, to give it to Infants; but it was never an universal custom in all Churches, as Baptism of Infants and Sureties have been. Why we omit it in our Church, I have given sufficient and satisfactory Reasons. For the evidence that Mr. Stennet brings from *Suicerus* concerns us not. He charges next, the *Vandois* and *Albigensis* with the denial of Baptism to Infants; and brings *Chassanion*, who speaks not upon his own knowledge, but says, Some Writers have affirm'd, that the *Albigensis* approved not of the Baptism of Infants; others, that they entirely slighted this Holy Sacrament, as if it were of no use either to great or small. Will Mr. Stennet crave kindred with such Despisers and Rejecters of Christ's Ordinance? He offers to prove it by *Bernard's* Testimony, a Devout Man, but a Popish Abbot of *Clarenavaux*: That Party represented them to the World as black as Slander

Slander and Lying could paint them, to excuse the Cruelties and Butcheries acted upon them. Now is it reasonable that we should give credit to *Petrus Cluniacensis* a railing Abbot, and to the rest of their sworn Enemies, rather than to indifferent Persons, who speak of them without prejudice? *Hoveden*, *Rainerius*, *Jacob de Riberia* in *Collect. de urbe Tholeff.* *Balthazar Lydius* Tom. 2. p. 285. In a Confession presented to *Uladiſlaus* King of Hungary, Arch-bishop *Usher*, and *Aneas Sylvius*, afterwards Pope *Pius* the 11d. in his History of *Bohem.* c. 35. free them from this accusation, which may have taken its Rise, from their refusing to have their Children Baptized by the Popish Priests. In *Paul Perrins's* Hist. l. 1. p. 3. c. 3. We find their Confession of Faith in these words; *Baptism is administred in a full Congregation of the Faithful to this end, that he that is receiv'd into the Church, shou'd be reputed by all for a Brother, and that all the Congregation might pray for him, that he may be a Christian in Heart, as he is outwardly esteem'd for One. And for this cause it is, that we present our Children in Baptism, which they ought to do to whom the Children are nearest, as their Parents, and they to whom God hath given this Charity.* *Du Plessis Mornay* affirms, That neither they, nor *Henry*, nor *Peter Bruis* their Teachers, were Enemies of Infant Baptism, as our Adversaries wou'd perswade the World, from the
lying

216 *A Vindication of Infant-Baptism,*

lying Histories of their Popish Butchers, the Monks and Fryars of those days. The *Bobemians* were their Brethren, and by their Confession of Faith we may judge, whether the *Vaudois* were against Infants Baptism as Mr. Stennet wrongfully accuses them. He may as well declare them to be Enemies of all Baptism, as some of the Papists have affirm'd, as *Mariana* a Jesuit, from the Writings of *William Nangiacus*, and *Peter a Cislertian* Monk, in a Book dedicated to *Pope Innocent III.* These are the words of *Mariana*, of the Opinions of the *Vaudois*: That Priests have no Power to forgive Sins; That the Body of Christ is not in the Sacrament; That the Water of Baptism hath no power to cleanse the Soul from Sin, &c. Mr. Stennet quotes Dr. Allix's Remarks on the Church of *Piedmont*; and concerning *Gundolphus* and his followers in *Italy*, A. D. 1025. That they denied Infant-Baptism; But Mr. Stennet suppresses the following account, where 'tis said, that they denied the Sacrament of Baptism to the Adult, as well as to Infants. These Men were of the perswasion of the *Manichees* and of the present *Quakers*, as *Ecbertus* informs us. And will our Anabaptists challenge them to be their Brethren who deny all Baptism? The Orthodox Perswasion of the ancient *Vaudois* in Relation to Infant Baptism, may appear from the former evidences, and from the Posterity of the Remnant of those persecuted People, driven

driven up into the Barren Mountains of the *Alpes* for shelter. At the beginning of the Reformation they agreed and joyned with the Protestants in this and other Articles and Practices. Therefore Mr. *Stennet* Slanders those worthy Confessors of the Orthodox Faith with the Popish Crue, by saying they approved not of Infant Baptism. What Mr. *Stennet* alledges out of *Vansleb.* of the Church of *Alexandria's* not Baptizing Infants in the first Ages, depends upon the hear-say of a *Dominican Fryar*. From what Author he had it, or from what Authority, is uncertain. 'Tis unreasonable to give any Credit to him, or to *Ludovicus Vives*, Annotator upon St. *August.* He might have understood from that ancient Father, that no Sect or Church in the first Ages ever denied Baptism to Infants, if they own'd the Holy Scripture. But I would ask Mr. *Stennet*, while we have plain evidences from Antiquity, and the next Ages to the Apostles, of Infants being Baptized, as of *Origen* and others, and good Authors to prove that constant Practice; shall we believe *Vives*, *Suicerus*, *Curcellanus*, or any other, who living above a Thousand years after, offer to impose such an Untruth and Error upon the Christian World, which we know to be so, and have proved it. When we see the Sun Shines, shall we believe a Thousand Blind Persons who affirm the contrary. What he quotes

218 *A Vindication of Infant-Baptism,*

next out of *Justin Martyr, Tertullian, Basil, Jerom,* and *Dr. Barrow,* relates to Adult Persons and not to Infants ; and whereas he pretends to be tried by the Word of God, I could wish that he and his Party would hearken to Christ's Invitation of little Infants to come to his Baptismal Covenant, and examine with unprejudiced Minds the plain Proofs that I have brought, for the Baptizing of our Children, out of Scripture, and the general Approbation of this Religious Custom in all Ages ; he would read there the Condemnation of his Pernicious Errors and gross mistakes. Is it probable that a handful of Men, or a few, should be able to discover and see more than the whole Christian Church, while we have the same helps and assistances as they can pretend to, and altogether as much zeal and affection for Truth, as our Adversaries can have ? They pretend to appeal to the Holy Scripture, and profess to have no other Rule of their Faith and Worship ; But was this Holy Scripture never understood by Christ's Churches and People, till *N. Storke, Th. Muncer, Knipperdoling, Servetus, John of Leyden,* the vilest of Men, and our Mechanick Teachers, the Tinckers, Porters, Tallow-chandlers, Tin-men, Pewterers, Thatchers, Black smiths, Butchers, Small-coal-men, and such like Fellows as are Preachers amongst the *Anabaptists* have reveal'd it to the World. Are we all in the dark

dark? And must we be instructed of the true sense of Holy Scripture by these Men, when some of 'em can scarce Write or Read? We are warned by *St. Peter*, That 'tis no new practice for such as are *unlearned to wrest the Scripture to their own Destruction*, 2. *Peter* 3. 16. They have not any Text of that blessed Word of God, to favour the denying of Baptism to Infants, or for to tie and confine us to the Mode of Dipping, as I have made it appear; therefore Mr. *Stenner's* vaunting and boasting of Holy Scripture and of Divine Revelation to be on their side, is vain, frivolous, groundless and false. All his other Paragraphs to the end of his Fourth Chapter I have sufficiently answered before.

In Mr. *Stenner's* fifth Chapter, I shall pass over his drolling Reflections upon Mr. *Russen*, and begin with his saying, *I know no Authority the Composers of Liturgies have to apply any one promise of Christ to Infant Baptism; Our Saviour never annexes a promise to any act which he has not required.* I answer, But if Christ hath required Baptism instead of Circumcision, to introduce Children into his Church and Kingdom, as I have proved, then the promise of the forgiveness of Sin and of God's favour is annexed to it; not by the Composers of our Liturgies as he scandalously insinuates, but by Christ, whose Ordinances and Promises, he and his Party Protanely Contemn. He adds, And as to

220 *A Vindication of Infant-Baptism,*
the Promises as made by Infants when Baptiz'd,
to renounce the Devil, &c. they are incapable
of entering into such Engagements. Who
says they are? But others may ingage in
their Names, and for them, when they are
to be admitted to a Privilege by all the
Rules and Laws Humane and Divine, as I
have already proved, and by the Custom of
Nations. What he says next, is not altoge-
ther true, *Whatever Obligation is upon them*
to devote themselves to the Service of Christ
when Adult, it does not arise from any Pro-
mise they made in Infancy, but from the Au-
thority of the Divine Commands. The Obliga-
tion to devote our selves to the service of
Christ, ariseth from our Relation to him
as Creatures, from his benefits confer'd upon
us in Providence and Redemption, unto which
we were admitted in our Baptism to be
partakers; which Obligations were confirm'd
and increas'd by the Promise then made in
our Names, as well as by the Divine Com-
mands. Therefore Mr. Stenner's Reason,
That the Vow of their Sureties cou'd not bind
their Consciences, is Grounded upon a false
Supposition, That it was the Sureties Vow;
whereas by the expressions of the Rubrick,
he might have understood that it was the
Childrens Vow, declar'd for them in their
Name by those Charitable Friends. And
that such a Vow and Engagement is binding,
our Church declares in the Catechism.
Which Promise when they come to Age them-
selves,

selves, i. e. the Children, are bound to perform.
 Mr. Stennet proceeds on in his mistakes, by questioning the Lawfulness of such a Vow. I must tell him, That this is a general and indisputable Rule in this Case in Theology, that it is Lawful, and our Duty to Promise and Vow, when we are otherwise bound to perform, by the indispensable Obligations of Creation, Providence, Benefaction, and Redemption. And that at this time, that we are enter'd into Christ's Church and Kingdom, and intitled to the Benefits of his Redemption in his Holy Ordinance, a Stipulation between him and his New Subjects, is lawful and reasonable, and hath always been judg'd requisite by Christians in all Ages; and as Infants cannot make it for themselves, their Sureties make it for them, for the obtaining the Benefits. Were there no other Obligation but this, that we are thereby enroll'd amongst Christ's Disciples, and Subjects of his Spiritual Kingdom, it would be binding on us, to accomplish such Vows and Promises: Therefore we are so far from judging it a Temerity, that we think it our Duty, and a Duty that so great a Favour and an Honour deserve from us, *To renounce the Devil and all his Works, &c.* And as often as we are call'd upon or required to enter into such an engagement, we look upon it as a Sin to refuse it. Were the Substance of the Baptismal Vow indifferent, Mr. Stennet might have reason for his

false Hypothesis : but besides the other great Obligations, the considerable advantages then procur'd to us, which would not have been granted without, engage our Consciences to a Punctual Performance, as far as lies in our power, because we reap the Benefits now and hereafter of such Charitable Vows and Promises, tho' made without our previous or concurring consent; but approved of by us afterwards with a thankful acknowledgement. Therefore what Mr. Stennet allleges out of Bishop *Sanderson*, relates not to our Case, which may be Parallell'd in our Courts of Judicature, in our Court Leets, and Court Barons, where *Guardians of Minors* answer, engage, and promise for them ; which engagement and promise, when they come to Maturity they are bound to make good, because they reap the benefit of such Promises, by enjoying the grants. If any offer to refuse to perform them, they forfeit their Estates, Honours, and Deeds. The case is the same here : If any for whom Sureties were so Charitable to engage and promise for them, at their Reception into Christ's Church by Baptism, will, when they come to years of Discretion, refuse to observe such Promises, they forfeit their Christianity by their Apostacy and Rebellion. This is no prejudice to the Sureties, whose kindness is in no wise deserving blame, but the Damage falls upon those unworthy Wretches, who instead of serving
Christ,

Christ, obey the Devil: Therefore the Conclusions that Mr. *Stennet* draws in the next Paragraph from these false Positions are Erroneous. And Mr *Stennet* mistakes the next matter in Question, which Mr. *Russen* hath not well stated. We say, that their Profelytes, by being dipped by them, renounce their first Baptism, and the Benefits of it by being Rebaptized, not the Vows and Promises made in their Names, which as he says, are personally reiterated, when they enter into their Sect. They renounce likewise their first Profession, and are Apostates to their Religion, by engaging themselves amongst a Party Enemies to it; by their declaring their first Baptism null and void, they despise, and by this act lose all the Advantages there procur'd to them from the Mercy of God, as we shall observe in examining Apostacy and the Sin against the Holy Ghost, of which many of 'em are Guilty. Mr. *Stennet* to justify himself and the *Anabaptists* in the next Place, from the Suspicion of *Arianism*, and *Antitrinitarianism*, appeals to their Publick Confessions. I have this to reply here, That many of them may be Orthodox in this Article of our Creed; but I have known some Anabaptists guilty of this damnable Error, and that tho' their last Confession of 1689, may be Publish'd in the name of that Sect of the *Anabaptists*, there are many of them who dissent from the Doctrines there contain'd.

The Sixth long Chapter of Mr. *Stenner's* Answer, that treats of Dipping, I have already examin'd in my Reply to *R. M.* and likewise his Seventh, where he vindicates the Authority and Commission of his *Mechanick Teachers*, who intrude into the Ministry without a lawful Call. And I have also proved from the Word of God, That their common People have no Right of Election of their superior Ministers, nor any a Capacity for that purpose. Therefore 'tis no Blasphemy or Slander, to call them Ministers of Satan's Empire. Others, that discourse of the Jesuits Practices to promote the Principles of the *Anabaptists*, and of their Assemblies, Marriages, Extream Unction, and Burials, I shall pass over to the Tenth Chapter, that answer's Mr. *R's* Ninth Chapter, of the Heretical and Schismatical Tenents of the *Anabaptists*.

I shall not here justify Mr. *R's* Charge against the *Anabaptists*, of being guilty of all the Errors that he imputes unto them; indeed the Foreign *Anabaptists* were condemn'd for, and infected with those Heresies; but ours in *England* bear a more plausible Profession; however, I find them divided and separated in their Opinions. These are they that I have taken particular notice of.

First, *Free-will-Baptists*, who, as their Name imports, maintain a Free-will in Man to do Good or Evil: A Liberty in his Choice not deter-

determin'd, nor inclin'd inwardly by any Propensity in Nature, but always abiding in an *equilibrium*, till his Will weighs down the Balance. This Opinion is not agreeing with their Confession of Faith. What other Positions these hold contrary to the Orthodox Belief, I cannot understand.

Secondly, *Particular-Baptists*, who fancy that God has made choice of a particular Number to be saved, and that they are in the Catalogue.

Thirdly, *Sabbath-day-Baptists*, or the observers of the *Jewish Sabbath*, instead of the *Lord's-day*. Mr. Stennet acknowledges himself to be of that Opinion; and yet he appeals frequently to their publick Confession of Faith, as the *Criterion* of the *Anabaptists* Religion, from which he varies in this Article. I shall prove the *Jewish Sabbath* to have been abolished, and the *Lord's day*, the Day of the Resurrection, to have been appointed in its stead: Therefore God's Command for the Observation of the *Seventh-day*, is in force only in relation to the *Sabbath* of our Lord and Saviour, who then rested from his meritorious and great Work of Redemption. And our Prayer at the End of that Precept, *That God would incline our Hearts to keep this Law*, is design'd for the religious keeping that Day God hath appointed under the Gospel. For the Scripture is express, that this Day was observed and celebrated by St. Paul, and the *Gentile Christians*,

226 *A Vindication of Infant-Baptism,*

stians; and none but such as were fond of the Jewish Rites, as Mr. Stennet seems to be, by maintaining the necessity of their Immersions and Washings all over, as well as in this particular, left off the Observation of the Jewish Sabbath, and kept the Christian in lieu of it: Therefore St. Paul saith, Col. 2. 16, 17. *Let no Man judge you in Meat or Drink, or in respect of an Holy Day, or of the new Moon, or of the Sabbath-days. Which are a shadow of things to come, but the Body is of Christ.*

Fourthly, *Soul-sleeping-Baptists*, who maintain that the Souls of Men enter not into a State of Immortality at their Egress of the Body, but sleep with their outward Tabernacles till the Day of the Resurrection, when they shall revive again. This was the old Arabian Error, opposed by Origen, Euseb. lib. 6. cap. 36. and taken up by some of the Anabaptists in the County of Essex. But it seems Mr. Stennet is Orthodox, and agrees with his Confession of Faith in this Point.

Fifthly, *Pelagian-Baptists*, who deny Original Sin. I have in my custody a long non-sensical Letter, written to me by one George Burr, an Anabaptist, an Oatmeal-Man, living about Drury-Lane against Original Sin. And I believe many are infected with that Heresy amongst the Anabaptists.

Sixthly, *Socinian-Baptists*, who deny the Divinity of our Saviour, and are Enemies of

of the Holy Trinity. I have discours'd with one *John Webbe*, whose Name I find in the *Anabaptists* Confession of Faith, A. 1644. He was a desperate *Unitarian*, and died lately a Pensioner of one of the Companies of *London*, having wasted all his Substance. This wicked Heresy hath poison'd the Judgments of many of this Sect, tho' it is contrary to their last Confession of Faith.

Seventhly, *Legs of Mutton-Baptists*, so named, because at the Celebration of the Lord's Supper, as they pretend, they sit down at Table, and Feast themselves with Legs of Mutton and other Meats, at the time of breaking the Bread, and distributing the Wine. I can hear but of one Congregation of them, in *Lambert-Street* near *White-Chappel*.

Eighthly, *Antinomian-Baptists*, whose absurd Opinions concerning the Law of God, Faith, Salvation and our Relation to Christ, are reckon'd up by Mr. *Pagitt*, in his *Heresiography*. The *Antinomians* first appear'd in *New-England* at *Boston*, and open'd a Door to all Debauchery and Wickedness, by their Abominable Doctrines. Divers of our *Anabaptists* have entertain'd their Principles.

Ninthly, *Millennian-Baptists*, or *Millennaries*, who fantasie that Christ shall come to reign on Earth one Thousand Years, and that they are to prepare for his coming, by destroying all the Ungodly. This was the Opinion of the
Fifth.

228 *A Vindication of Infant-Baptism,*
Fifth-Monarchy-Baptists, which stir'd them up
to that Mad Insurrection, in the Beginning of
King Charles II's Reign.

I must here take notice, that all *Anabaptists*
plead Holy Scripture, as far as they think it
will agree with their Principles and Opinions;
but either reject it, or give it a false Inter-
pretation, when they find that it contradicts
their Errors. And their common Practice is,
to boast of Holy Scripture to be of their
side, and to perswade the ignorant and un-
advised, That *Pedobaptism* is a Popish Error
retain'd by the Protestants; That the first
Ages never admitted any to Baptism, till
they could profess Faith and Repentance;
That Dipping was then the constant Mode
of Baptism; That they are no Christians,
who use any other Method but a total Im-
mersion of the Body; That therefore who-
ever desires to partake of the Redemption
of Christ, must be Re-baptized by them;
That the Ordinances are by them Admini-
stred in the greatest Purity; and that their
Perswasion recommends nothing but Holiness
and Sanctification, Love and Charity to Men,
Piety and Zeal to God. By these Insinuat-
ions they have shaken the Faith of many
simple Souls, and drawn them to their Pro-
fession. And in reading Mr. Stennet's Book,
one would think him to be an *Angel* come
down from Heaven, or one of those *Seraphims*
of Love and Light, sent to instruct the *Pedo-*
baptists and the World. How often does he
boast

boast of the Doctrines of the *Anabaptists* founded on the Word of God? As if he had produced, and could shew express Texts of Holy Scripture, to forbid the Baptism of Infants, and to command the Mode of dipping over Head and Ears; whereas neither he nor any of them, can pretend to conclude any such Doctrines or Practices, but from Suppositions and uncertain Consequences; upon which sandy Foundation the whole Fabrick of their Religion and Separation is built. Could they have as plain a Text of Holy Scripture, to forbid Children to come to Christ, as we have to bring them, they might have some Plea for their Profession: Could they produce any Passage to prove Baptism a needless Ordinance, in order to Salvation; or that Children are to be excluded from it; or that Sprinkling is not the Mode, but only Dipping, we should be ready to applaud and approve the Discovery. But while we have Holy Scripture, Reason, and the Practice of the Universal and Catholick Church of all Ages and Nations on our side, recommending the Baptism of Infants, and allowing the Mode of Sprinkling to be sufficient and lawful, we have cause to reject this new Sect and their Doctrines, as pernicious, contrary to the Mind and Interest of Christ, and destructive to the Souls of Infants.

Again, When we examine further, what a Devilish Brood of Errors and Heresies are harbour'd

230 *A Vindication of Infant-Baptism,*

harbour'd under this Sect, and countenanced by their Teachers, *Socinianism, Arianism, Judaism, Chilianism, &c.* we cannot look upon this Sect as tolerable, but as a Complication and Rendezvouz of Divers Damnable Heresies; for tho' their Confession of Faith speaks the contrary, under this Name of the *Anabaptists* they cannot deny but all these grievous Heresies are entertain'd and shelter'd. That they are Hereticks upon the Account of denying Baptism to Infants, I prove it by the Definition of Mr. Tombes: *Whoever holdeth any Error in Religion, and laboureth to make a Party for it, is an Heretick.* We may add, that they are some of the worst of Hereticks, when we consider the wicked and woful Consequence formerly mention'd, of their Principles and Doctrines.

Mr. Stennet, at the latter end of his Book mis-interprets, 1 Cor. 7. 14. the *Holiness* of Believers Children, to be understood of *Legitimacy*, and their *Uncleanness* of *Illegitimacy*, which cannot be the Meaning of the Apostle; for among the Pagans, Children were lawfully born in Matrimony; if that were able to qualify them *Holy*, they who were so born in Wedlock deserv'd that Title. Neither can this Word *Holy* declare them to be Church-Members without Baptism, the introducing Ordinance. This Exposition was embraced by several of the Ancient Fathers, who from hence concluded,

that

that they were baptized in their Infancy. Therefore Mr. Stenner's Conclusion is insignificant, *That all Adult Children may be supposed to have been Church-Members too, as soon as one of their Parents became a Believer.* Whatever some may affirm, none can be reckon'd truly Church-Members, until they be initiated into the Church and Covenant by Baptism. Neither can any Holiness be appropriated to the Children, according to St. Paul's meaning, who were born before either Parent was a Believer, but to such as were born since their Christianity. When I examine the *Apostle's* Argument, I cannot but approve of Mr. Stenner's first Conclusion, *That the Holiness of the Children here spoken of, must be derived as well from the Sanctification of the unbelieving Parent, as that of the Believer.* But I deny the second, that limits their Holiness to a *Legitimacy* only, for the Reason afore-mention'd. Now for the better understanding of St. Paul, we are to mind God's Promise to *Abraham* and his Believing Seed, *I will be thy God and of thy Seed after thee.* When therefore the Apostle saith, That the believing Husband or Wife sanctifies the unbelieving Partner, 'tis to be understood in relation to the Children that are born of them, who are therefore said to be Holy; for God claims a Right to the Seed of such a Parent, tho' the other be an Infidel, because one is a Believer. Therefore this Sanctification can't be understood of the

the Person who continues in his Infidelity, but only in relation to the Act of Generation, as they perform the Part of a Husband or Wife. Their Seed, that issue from them, their Children, that are born, are as it were God's Heritage, Christ's Peculium; therefore Holy by a Designation, not only from their Parents, as Mr. Stennet saith, but from God himself, to be his Servants. From hence it necessarily follows that as soon as they are born, they are to be brought to Christ, enter'd into his Church, and dedicated to God by Baptism. 'Tis for that purpose that St. Paul saith, That the believing Husband or Wife sanctifies the Seed of the unbelieving, by virtue of this Promise; God challenging that Child as his. And if they be thus Holy by God's Designation, I may speak as the Voice did to Peter, *Acts 10. What God hath cleansed, that call not thou common.* And if they are thus Holy by Designation only from the Womb, doubtless they have a Right to the Seal of Holiness and Sanctification, to the Laver of Regeneration, to free them from Original Guilt and Corruption. Therefore Mr. Stenner's Inferences from his erroneous Suppositions are false; and his Assertion *That he hath proved before, that a credible Profession of Faith and Repentance, ought to be made by all those who are admitted to Baptism, before they can be accounted proper Subjects of that Ordinance,* is not true. We acknowledge those

Conditions

Conditions are required in the Adult ; but Infants, as we have made it appear from the Word of God, &c. are to be admitted without any such actual or personal Profession. I intreat Mr. Stennet, a Man of Learning and Abilities, but engaged in his erroneous Sect, to weigh these Reasons, to examine my Arguments ; and, if he has any love for Truth and Unity, to act for the time to come as an unprejudiced Conscience can advise and direct him, for the Glory of God, and the Good of Souls. And I cannot but lament, that such a Person so well qualified, as he seems to be, should be so deeply plung'd and dipp'd over Head and Ears, and stick so fast in a Spiritual Quagmire, in an Heretical Sect, as St. *Augustine* was in that of the *Manichees* Nine Years, as he confesseth. I pray God to open his Eyes, that he may see his Errors, and repent for the Mischief that he hath done to the Church of God, and to the Evangelical Truths, by his fallacious Wit and Reasoning in his Book ; and let him seriously consider how many weak Souls he has thereby destroy'd and deluded, for whom he must be accountable to our Great Judge.

Mr.

Mr. Joseph Hooke's fallacious Apology for the Baptized Believers, in Answer to Mr. Eratt, Vicar of Hatfield near Doncaster, in Yorkshire; briefly examin'd by the Word of God, and Right Reason.

THE Occasion of publishing this Apology, was one *John Woodward*, Mr. *Eratt's* Parishioner, perverted to the Sect of the *Anabaptists*. This good and zealous Minister of Christ, as his Duty oblig'd him, represented in writing to the *Apostate* his hainous Crime, with just Reflections upon that Heretical and Schismatical Party. Upon reading Mr. *Eratt's* Letter, this *Joseph Hooke*, as he styles himself an *Apostle*, ordain'd by *Stanley* and *Grantham*, writes and publishes this deceitful *Apology*, which he stuffs with the most impudent Falsties, bold Forgeries, groundless Suppositions, erroneous Principles, and grievous Mistakes, both in Holy Scripture and History : All this he delivers for Gospel, to deceive his ignorant Profelytes, and the credulous Mob. And to gain more Credit, and procure Acceptance to his Hypocritical Performance, he professeth nothing but Meekness, Charity, Love, and Friendship to our Church and People, while his whole Design is to deny us a Right to Christianity, and

cut our Throats. From such Diabolical Friends and Friendship, Good Lord deliver us !

Through his Book, in every Page, a bold, presumptuous subtil and lying Spirit of Satan, is remarkable disguised and mask'd under a Christian Vizard. I shall begin to examine his First Chapter, where he saith, *That the People called Anabaptists, are not rightly so called, and are no new Sect.* I am to prove the contrary. Now the Justice of this Title given to them, depends upon our Right Mode of Baptism, according to Christ's Institution, which we practise either in Dipping or Sprinkling in Infancy. This we judge to be lawful, in obedience to his Invitation and Command. If we be in the Right, as I have fully proved, and our Adversaries Judgment erroneous, as certainly it is in this Case, their Dipping must be a Re-baptization, not into the Christian Church, which by that Act their Profelytes renounce, but into their Sect : Therefore they are properly nam'd *Anabaptists*. A Sect that lays such a Stress upon Dipping over Head and Ears, that they account all *Christians* who have not a total Immersion, to be yet in the State of Nature, without God and Christ, and out of the Covenant of Grace. *J. H.* pretends, that they are for mending an Error in our Baptism ; but until they can prove by the Word of God, that there is one in baptizing our Infants, as Christ hath appointed,

236 *A Vindication of Infant-Baptism,*
pointed, by the Application of Water, as
our Church prescribes, they are under a
great Mistake, and deserve the Name of
Anabaptists.

I cannot but here take notice, That *J. Hooker*
adds an improper Question to our *Rubrick*,
that is not there. As if the Minister should
question the People, after they had witnessed
that the Child had been baptized with Water
and in the Name of the Father, &c. *Whether*
think you the Child be lawfully and perfectly
baptized? Our Church declares, after the
Answer to the Two first Questions, all things
to be well done, and does not doubt of the
Legality or Perfection of the Administra-
tion. To appeal afterwards to the Opinion
of the Assistants, *Whether the Child had been*
lawfully and perfectly baptized? was nonsense,
and would betray a Weakness in our Judg-
ments and Rules, of which we were never
guilty. But this Man, as the rest of his
Comrades, is for Forgery and Lying, with-
out which he cannot support his wicked Per-
swasion. I shall discover many more, in the
Sequel of his *Apology.*

Now what reason have these People to
claim the Name of Christian, as proper
only to them? since by adhering to, and
engaging themselves in this Sect by being
Dipped, they have denied their first *Christi-*
anity, as a Nullity. What reason have they
to challenge the Title of *Baptized Believers*,
or *Baptized Christians?* as if none were *Bap-*
tized

ized Christians, and Baptized Believers, but they. They may be called *Dippers*, and a *Dipping-Sect*; but I deny their Baptism to be legal, because perform'd by such Persons, who have no Authority from our Lord to administer his Sacraments, and because 'tis in Contradiction to ours lawfully and justly perform'd. Neither is that other Title proper to this *Sect*, which *J. H.* affects: *A People of the Primitive Christian Religion*, since none of the Primitive Times who allowed of Baptism, did ever deny it to Infants, if we may believe *St. Augustine*, and the Ancient Records. And the Mode of Sprinkling was ever practised in the Church, and reckon'd lawful, as I have already proved. Likewise such as were baptized in Infancy, were, by all *Sects* and Divisions of Christianity, judg'd to be lawfully Baptized, till the *Anabaptists* appeared. Therefore this Name that he ascribes to his *Sect*, is improper, and contrary to Truth: They are a *Sect* of a later Date, not yet Two Hundred Years standing. He saith next, *If we are mistaken we cannot help it*. That they are mistaken is most certain, and sufficiently proved, both in respect of the Subjects and Mode of Baptism; and they might help and rectify their Mistakes, if they would set aside their Prejudices and Partiality, and sincerely hearken to Holy Scripture, Reason, and the unanimous Consent of all the Ancient and Modern Churches of Christ,

Christ, who ever did and do yet Baptize their Infants, and approve of Sprinkling as lawful. He adds; *'Tis our Unhappiness but no Damning Sin.* I answer, 'tis not so much their Unhappiness as their wilful Blindness, Perverseness, and Obstinacy. And I appeal to all Mankind, whether an Apostacy from a Church of Christ, as ours is, to a Schismatical and Heretical Sect, be not a damning Sin? Don't they, deserve Damnation upon another account; for excluding so many Infant Souls out of the Covenant and Church of Christ, and Condemning them to remain in the Polluted State of Nature, under the Empire of Satan, in opposition to our Lord's Will and Command? Is not so Pernicious a Rebellion and Disobedience against Christ's expresse Orders, a Damning Sin?

The next Question is, *Whether the Anabaptists be a New or Old Sect*; for the better understanding this Question, we are to have a Right Definition and Notion of this Sect, as it appears amongst us. In my apprehension 'tis a Sect maintaining a Separation from the Orthodox and Establish'd Church of Christ in the Nation; or to speak in their language, from our National Church, divided from its Communion, because of Infant-Baptism, the mode of Sprinkling in usage amongst us, and other exceptions against our Religion and Worship. Which Sect declares our Baptism and Christianity Null upon that account, therefore dippeth all Per-

sons that joyn with them. Now that any such Sect was ever in being before *Nicholas Storke* and *Thomas Muncker* began it in *Germany*, A. D. 1521, or 1522. no History nor Record can be Produc'd. *Melancton* a Worthy Divine and Zealous Reformer, *Sleidan* in his Commentaries and other credible Authors make mention of their first appearance, which was usher'd into the Credulous World by feigned Visions, and pretended Revelations, and was attended by a dismal Train of Rebellions, Murders, Thefts, Sacrileges, Adulteries, and other horrid Crimes acted by these Religious Sectaries; Their first coming into *England* out of *Holland* was about the year 1535; but they never made any Figure till about the beginning of our Civil Wars 1642 or 1643. when they Associated into Seven distinct Congregations, and Publish'd their first Confession of Faith, subscribed by Fifteen Persons in the Names of Seven Churches in *London*. Now to make a right judgment of the beginning of this Sect, we must take this Body of Men as really it is, with all its Essentials and Circumstances, as we have described it, and we dare affirm, That no such Sect was ever known in any Nation before the Year 1521. Some before that time may have entertain'd divers Errors that these Sectaries now embrace, as the *Antitrinitarians*, who denied the Trinity as our *Socinian Anabaptists* do; the *Pelagians* who were against Original Sin, yet were for
 Infant

240 *A Vindication of Infant-Baptism,*

Infant-Baptism ; but our *Pelagian-Anabaptists* agree with them in the first perswasion ; but differ in the other. The *free-will Anabaptists* are infected with the Errors of the *Donatists*, *Encratists*, *Cathari*, and *Novatians*. The *Fifth-Monarchy-Anabaptists* are of the opinion of the Ancient *Chiliasm* ; So of the other old Heresies that some of the *Anabaptist* Congregations do now receive, which cannot make this Sect of the same Ancient date : because those Primitive Hereticks Condemn'd as such by all the Churches of Christ differ'd not in Infant Baptism from them, nor separated from the *Catholicks* of those days upon that account, as ours do from us. That some otherwise Orthodox *Christians* in the first Ages were for *Rebaptization* of Penitent *Apostates* and Converted Hereticks, is not denied : But those Men, as *Cyprian* and others, never refused Baptism to Infants, nor judg'd the Mode of Sprinkling to be unlawful ; and never canton'd or divided into a distinct Sect from the rest of *Christians*, for such Practices, as ours do : Therefore 'tis unreasonable to challenge their Beginning but from those, who first commenced the Separation for the same Reasons and Causes for which these amongst us maintain theirs. Now before *Nicholas Storke*, *Thomas Muncer*, *John of Leyden*, and the *German* and *Munster* Rebellions, we find no such Separation upon the same account in any credible History. *J. H.* labours to wipe off the stain, and shift off the reproach

of the filthy practices and abominable actions of the *Munster-Anabaptists*, which indeed concern not such of them as are peaceable-minded amongst us, were it not that the same Spirit of Confusion that was in those first Sectaries, appears in many of our *Anabaptist-Zealots*. It dares not now act over the same *Tragedies* for fear of the Laws. What he saith to excuse his *German Brethren*, That some *Lutherans*, not *Baptists*, were Ring-Leaders and chief Promoters of that Sedition, is false. There might have been some disturbance before, occasion'd by the Preaching of the Gospel in that City from the Papists; but as soon as this Sect got the upper hand, which they obtain'd by Fighting and Murder of the *Evangelicks*; one of their Preachers proclaim'd in the Streets of the City, That all should be destroyed that were not Baptized again, and the *Lutherans* were Banish'd and threatned with Death, as soon as *John of Leyden* had been Proclaim'd King of *Sion*; as for *Bernard Rotman*, 'tis true he had been a *Lutheran* Preacher, but he became an *Apostate*, and joyn'd with that Sect in the Rebellion, and in promoting the perswasion and Kingdom of the *Anabaptists*: The Foundation being laid and begun at *Munster*, was likely to spread further, and take in *Amsterdam*, had not this *Fanatical Cruelty* been prevented and suppressed. The truth of this Relation appears so plain from the Attestations of *Sleidan*, *Hortensius*, *Pontanus*, *Osiander*,
L *Melancton*,

242 *A Vindication of Infant-Baptism,*
Melancton, and other worthy Historians of
those Days and Countries, who writ of
these Transactions upon their certain know-
ledge, that we have more reason to believe
them than *Dr. Will. Russell*, or *Tileman Jan*
van Bright, or any other prejudiced Ana-
baptist of our Days. And as for the Multitudes
of the *Waldenses* in *Bohemia* of his Perswasion
'tis altogether false ; for by their Confessions
of Faith, they declared to be for Infant
Baptism, as we have already proved. He tells
us next of the Being of the Anabaptists in
the Reign of *Theodosius* and *Honorius*, which
is an untruth, that no Historian of those
Days ever mentioned : That the Ancient
Christian *Britains* were against Infant-Bap-
tism, when *Austin* the Monk came over from
Gregory Bishop of *Rome*, to Preach the Go-
spel to the *Saxons*, is a great Error, taken up
by *Mr. Danvers* from a Fabulous Historian,
Fabian, who is contradicted by *Beda* and
others. They approved not of the Innova-
tions of the *Romish* Church, and refus'd to
comply with its Baptism, but never denied
the Baptism of Infants. For *Pelagius* one of
that Nation, tho' he own'd no Original Sin,
yet he approved of Infant Baptism, as I have
made it appear. With what Confidence
could *Mr. Danvers*, and after him *J. H.* and
other Anabaptist writers bely those *British*
Christians and the Ancient *Waldenses*? *Paul*
Perin, in his History, justifies them from these
false Accusations of the lying Monks and
Friers

Friars, their sworn Enemies and Persecutor, by mentioning one of their Books, named *The Spiritual Almanack*, where they clear'd themselves of the false surmises against them. And some of their Posterity, at a Synod held at *Angrogne*, A. D. 1535. declared that the Baptism of Infants had been acknowledg'd by their Forefathers for some Hundreds of years before, as it is expressed in *Perin's History Wald. l. 2. c. 4.* *Oecolampadius* writ to them a very Religious Letter to confirm them in the Faith. He had disputed before with some *Anabaptists* at *Bazil*, *Ulm*, and *Ausburg*, about the year 1527 and 1529. If they forbore the Baptism of their Children, 'twas because they would not have them initiated into the Popish Religion; they delayed till their own Ministers came to them. This might give occasion for their Adversaries, as the *Abbots of Clugny* and *Clarevauux*, and other Popish Monks, to fasten upon them this lying and grievous Slander, That they were against Infant Baptism, which I cannot find to be true after a diligent perusal of the unprejudiced Historians of that Time.

For the *Fifth-Monarchy* Insurrection, *J. H.* says falsely, That there was but One *Anabaptist* amongst them. I find two expressly Named by *Mr. Pagitt*, that signed their first Confession of Faith 1644, i. e. *Kiffin* and *Patience*; and 'tis certain *Venner*, *Hodgkin*, *Gowler*, and others were of that persuasion. Likewise *John James* the Small-coal man was an *Anabaptist*

244 *A Vindication of Infant-Baptism,*
nabaptist Preacher. He was Executed at
Tyburn the 27th of November 1661. for Treason. The rest concern'd in that mad attempt
are justly thought to be of the same Opinion;
but distinguished from the other Anabap-
tists by their *Millenary Perswasion*, which
causeth them to fantasie, That Temporal Domi-
nion and Possession ought to be founded in
Grace, and the Godly only are to inherit
the Earth. Many of the most Eminent A-
nabaptists lean to this Opinion, and *J. H.*
gives us cause, Page 53. to suspect him to be
of that Sect, by the Texts that he Quotes for
that purpose. Now *J. H.* would have our
Holy Jesus, our Blessed Lord and Saviour, to
be the first Author and Founder of his Sect;
but if it believes and practises contrary to
the Mind and Gospel of our Redeemer, it
could never proceed from him; for our
Gracious Master was for Union amongst all
his Followers, *John 17. 21.* The Anabaptists
are for Separation, not only from all true
Christian People, but also amongst them-
selves. Jesus held Communion with the
Jews, tho' Superstitious in some observances,
John 6. 2 But this Sect is canton'd into
divers distinct Congregations, that have
broke off all Fellowship in Divine Worship
with us, upon idle Surmises and ill grounded
Suspensions. Jesus Invited Children to come
to him, *Mark 10. 14.* This Sect forbids them.
Jesus tells us, That of such is the Kingdom
of God, *Matt. 19. 14.* The Anabaptists
exclude

exclude them, by denying to them admittance. *Jesus* would have them enter'd into his Covenant, *Gen* 17. The Anabaptists won't allow them that privilege. Our Holy *Jesus* was kind and merciful to Babes; The Anabaptists are so cruel and barbarous to leave them in the Precincts of Satan's Empire, out of any Personal Right to the Kingdom and Redemption of Christ. In many other particulars they are quite contrary to the Rules, Commands, and Religion of our Blessed *Jesus*; therefore they can no more pretend to so Divine an Author, than the Jesuits who Glory in his Name, and claim him as their Original. If we may believe *Bullinger*, *Zuinglius*, *Melancton* and other Reformers of our Religion from the abuses of Popery, who saw the first Appearance of this Sect, The Devil was the principal Founder of the Anabaptist perswasion. The reason that we have to judge so, is because it tends to promote and encrease his Empire, and multiply the Subjects of his Kingdom, by excluding a Number of Infant Souls out of the Kingdom of Christ, and leaving them out of the ordinary and appointed way of Salvation. *J. H* in challenging Christ for the Author of his Sect, follows the footsteps of the *Arians*, *Eunomians*, *Novatians*, *Donatists*, and all other Hereticks Condemn'd by the Churches of Christ; for they father'd themselves upon him, and Usurp'd the Honour of his blessed Name, while they

246 *A Vindication of Infant-Baptism,*

undermin'd his interest, Religion and Gospel. To confirm the Ignorant in this Opinion, *J. H.* mentions a number of Men, who suffer'd, some for Rebellion, others for Religion, but few or none for the bare perswasion of the Anabaptists; yet he hath the Confidence to challenge them all as his: Whereas after they of *Zurick* had disputed, and been silenced by *Zuinglius* in the presence of the *Senate*, they continued to be Rebellious and Seditious; for which they suffer'd, as they deserved, a Death by Drowning. Doubtless the *Dutch-Anabaptists Martyrology* may have a number of feigned *Stories* and *Speeches*, as our Bloody *Affizes* of the *West of England*, of which we shall take Notice in the History. I know that Book to be Romantick, and most of the Dying *Speeches* to be Fabulous.

J. H. vainly and falsely pretends that they have no need of Ancient Records to prove the Antiquity of their Sect, while, as he says, they can prove all that they teach by the infallible Record of God's word; and that they can make it appear by that one Book, that their Perswasion is as old as Christ and his Apostles. But with what a false and impudent fancy this Man flatters himself and his Proselytes, I have already evidenc'd by the former Proofs of Infant-Baptism from Holy Scripture, Reason, and Antiquity.

This J. H. endeavours to prove in his Second Chapter, where he affirms, *That the Doctrine of the Anabaptists is according to the Scriptures.* He should have excepted the *Socinian Anabaptists*, the *Pelagian*, the *Antinomian*, and the *Anabaptists of Germany*, who said, *That Christ did not assume his Flesh from the Virgin Mary*; *That he is not true God*, but only endowed with more Gifts than other Men, &c. He should have excepted those other divisions of Anabaptists amongst us, that maintain most damnable Errors, and are for *Polygamy* or *Promiscuous Copulation*, as the *Adamites* and others. My Author confesseth a difference amongst them, and such differences as are against the Fundamental Articles of our Creed. Therefore to assert in general Terms, *That the Doctrine of the Anabaptists is according to the Scripture*, is a false assertion; but pray let us examine, how agreeable the Doctrine of the most Orthodox of this Se $\dot{c}$ t is to the Holy Scripture; for several of their Creeds I have examin'd, and find them differ and contradict one another; therefore they can't be all true: Indeed they are to be look'd upon as decoys to catch Wild-fowls in a Pond, or as Blinds, Beautiful Vizards to cheat the World into a good opinion of their Se $\dot{c}$ t; for by their Conformity to our Orthodox Faith in most Articles, of which they make a great Ostentation in their Printed Books, they would perswade Mankind, that there is no

248 *A Vindication of Infant-Baptism,*
difference between us, but in the Subjects
and Mode of Baptism; whereas the most
noted of them are known to be *Jewish Sab-*
bitarians, Antinomians, Socinians, Unitarians,
Arians, Millennaries, Adamites, and some are
Blasphemous Hereticks, &c. All these are
contain'd under the Name of *Anabaptists*, who
glory in their Publick Confessions, and yet
are of a contrary perswasion. I would ask
J. H. If the Doctrines of these and such
like Enemies of the true Christian Religion
and Faith, be according to the Scripture?
To what purpose do they own the Holy Scrip-
tures, as the infallible Rule of Faith and
Christianity, since he, and the most regular
of this Sect, contradict and wrest them to
the perverting of the true Sense; and refuse
to be Govern'd by them. For Instance, The
Holy Scriptures Command Believers Infants
to be Seal'd with the Seal of God's Covenant,
Gen. 17. 11. But the Anabaptists will not
suffer them. The *Holy Scriptures* appropriate
the promise to be the God of *Abraham's*
Seed, and the Covenant to Christ and his
Believing Disciples, *Acts 2. 39. Gal. 3. 16.*
17; but the Anabaptists say, The Covenant
and Promises were made only with *Abraham's*
Carnal Seed, *Keach's Rector rectifi'd,* p. 45.
The *Holy Scripture* orders Sucklings to be
brought and come to Christ, *Mark 10. 14;*
but the *Anabaptists* forbid them. The *Holy*
Scripture saith, *Except a Person be born of*
Water and the Spirit he cannot enter into the
Kingdom

Kingdom of God, *John* 3. 5. but the Anabaptists teach, That their Infants and others enter into God's Kingdom without the Ordinance or Baptism of Water, *Confes.* p. 38. and Scoff at our Obedience to Christ's Command and Practice; and they boldly affirm, that this Text requires no Material Water, contrary to *Ephes.* 5. 26. and *Titus* 3. 5. The *Holy Scripture* leaves to the Wisdom of the Governours of a Nation and Church, the Circumstantial part of God's Worship, to be order'd by the Light of Nature, and their Christian Prudence, giving general directions for that purpose, *1 Cor.* 11. *1 Cor.* 14. 26, 40. as one of their *Confes.* acknowledgeth p. 6. But *J. H.* and other Anabaptists reject our *Rubrick, Common Prayer, Liturgy*, and Publick Worship, order'd according to this Scripture Rule, by the Wisdom of the Nation, p. 34. to follow the dictates of their Giddy Brain. The *Holy Scripture* calls Sprinkling Baptism, *Heb.* 9. 10. as I have fully proved; but the Anabaptists won't yield to that Scripture Sense of the word; but give more credit to *Hesiod, Homer, Demosthenes, Plutarch, &c.* than to the Spirit of God. The *Holy Scripture* enjoyns us the Unity of the Spirit in the bond of Peace, *Ephes.* 4. 3. and to be of one mind in Religion, and the Service of God, *Phil.* 1. 27. *1 Pet.* 3. 8. *Rom.* 15. 6. But the Anabaptists are for Division and Sub-division, for separate Congregations, *Confes.*

250 *A Vindication of Infant-Baptism,*

c. 26. And they are so ridiculous to quarrel at our Union in a National Church, as if that were inconsistent with the Mind of Christ, *J. H.* p. 99. The Holy Scripture recommends to us a Ministry of God's and Christ's appointment and sending, *Matth.* 20. 2. *John* 17. 18, 20, 21. *Acts* 20. 28; but the Anapabtists will have none of God's choice and sending, but of the Peoples Election, and Commissioned by them, *Confel.* p. 88, 89. St. Paul foretold, *2 Tim.* 4. 3. *After their own Lusts shall they heap to themselves Teachers, having itching Ears.* The Holy Scripture hath assigned to Christ a Sovereignty and Monarchy over his Church, *Matth* 23. 1. *Luke* 1. 32, 33. But the Anabaptists have chang'd the Fundamental Constitution of Christ's Kingdom, and have alter'd it into a Democracy, where the People, who should be Taught and Govern'd, have Usurp'd the Supreme Authority to Command in Chief, to Teach, Controul, and Govern, contrary to the whole Current of Scripture.

I could alledge many more Particulars, in which their Doctrines and Practices are directly and plainly contrary to the *Holy Scriptures*, and the Mind of Christ. Therefore tho' *J. H.* and others of his Sect, may be Orthodox in Relation to the Trinity, the Divine and Humane Nature of Christ, and other Fundamental Articles of our Religion, he and all his *Anabaptists* are erroneous.

ous and heretical more or less, and maintain Tenets contrary to the Blessed Word of God. Their whole Religion is opposite to Christ and his Kingdom, and tends to advance the Devil's Interest and Dominion. Now considering the Premises, how vainly and falsely does Mr. *Hooke*, Mr. *Keach*, and their Deluded Comrades the *Anabaptists*, Deceivers of the People, boast of, and appeal to Holy Scripture and Divine Revelation, as if their Schism and Errors were founded in that Book of Truth. And 'tis remarkable that their Booksellers and Shopkeepers frequently glory in, and assert the *Bible* for their Signs. I can't compare them better than to an Hypocritical Fellow mention'd by *Erasmus*, who always carried about under his Arm a great Bossed *Bible*, but never look'd into it, or took any Direction from it. Their often proposing the Divine Scriptures as their Rule, is but an empty and vain Ostentation to deceive the credulous Vulgar. They have not one direct Syllable, that they can produce against Infant-Baptism, or the Mode of Sprinkling, out of the Word of God. What he saith next in relation to Humane and Divine Studies and Learning, concerns not our present purpose. Therefore having examin'd already his 3d. Chap. I pass over to his 4th, where I find a plain Contradiction in the Title: *A friendly Separation of the Baptized Believers, from the present Church of England, shew'd to be Just and Necessary.*

252 *A Vindication of Infant-Baptism,*
Necessary. An Hypocritical and Nonsensical
Title! as false and irrational as the Author.
For can there be a friendly Division in Reli-
gion? A friendly Schism? no more than a
friendly Civil War. Can Friendship, the
Product of Charity, that thinketh no
Evil, be the Ground of the *Anabaptists* Sepa-
ration from our Church? To pretend there-
fore Friendship in this Case, is the deepest
Hypocrisy, and a meer Paradox. But what
are the legal Causes, that this Apostle, not
of Christ, but of the grand Author of Di-
vision, pretends for his separating from our
Church? He mentions Seven.

First, *Because we cannot find she is as old as
the Scriptures.* And what Church is there in
the World, besides the *Jewish*, so ancient?
Are the *Anabaptist* Congregations, that ne-
ver made any Appearance amongst us Four-
score Years ago, of an equal Date with the
Scriptures? What a childish and frivolous
Reason is this for a Breach of Unity?
What matter is it, how lately the Church of
England is establish'd a Church, if it be
conformable to the Rules of the Gospel?
All the Churches now in the World, had
a Beginning. The Churches of *Italy, Rome,*
Asia, Greece, Egypt, Ethiopia, &c. were set-
tled since the Scriptures, by the Apostles.
If the Profelytes had been allowed to for-
sake them for such a slender Punctilio, none
would have held Communion with them long.
If the Churches be settled according to the
Laws

Laws of God, and the Mind of Christ, the Date of its first Establishment is insignificant. Were there any Doctrines to be embrac'd, or superstitious Practices requir'd in our Church, so as to render the Professors and Conformists criminal before God, it would be a lawful Plea for a Separation: But only because our Church is not as old as the Gospel, tho' it is agreeable to it, to leave and fall off from it, is a foolish Pretence and Act, that none but Brain-sick People can be guilty of. He mentions Five Pillars, upon which he saith our Church is built: *First*, The Book of Consecration of *Archbishops* and *Bishops*, of *Priests* and *Deacons*; all which relate to the orderly Government of our Church, ratified by the Wisdom of our Parliaments, whose Authority by this Separation they despise and reject. The *2d* is, Our *Liturgy* or *Common-Prayer*, which he scoffs at. The *3d* is, Our Thirty-nine *Articles* of our Confession of Faith. The *4th* is, The Book of *Canons*. The *Fifth* are, The Laws made in its favour by the Authority of the Nation, that have granted to these *Anabaptists* Indulgence, Liberty, and Protection. Therefore Separation from our Church, so well approved of by the unanimous Consent of so many Wise, Pious, and Learned Legislators, fully as understanding as a few Mechanick Pedlars, Tinkers, Cobblers, &c. of the *Anabaptists*, is a Contempt put upon their Judgment and Prudence, and

254 *A Vindication of Infant-Baptism,*

a Reflection upon their Piety and Wisdom, and an Act of Ungratitude. But I would have our Adversaries know, that as our Church is agreeable with the Holy Oracles, in all these Constitutions, it is built and settled upon Christ, the Chief Corner-stone, and is a true Christian Church, conformable to the Primitive Patterns. Therefore to leave such a Church is Apostacy from Christ, the Lord and Governor of it.

The *Second Cause* of his Separation is as childish as the first, 'tis *Because the present Church of England is a National Church, divided into Provincial, Diocesan and Parochial, which sort of Churches we find nothing of in Scripture.* Is this a sufficient cause of Separation, because for the more orderly Government of Christ's Church amongst us, and for the more convenient Instruction of our People, time out of Mind, our King's and Parliaments, God's Vice Gerents, have establish'd that Method? Is there any thing in this Constitution contrary to the Honour of God, or to any express Text of Holy Scripture, or to the Salvation of Men? In such Cases does not God command our Obedience and Compliance with the lawful Orders of our Superiors, 1 Pet. 2. 13. *Submit your selves to every ordinance of man for the Lord's sake.* The Christian Magistrate is appointed by God over us, to preserve the publick Peace and Decorum, as well in the Church, as in the State. Disobedience in this Case is

Rebellion against God, Rom. 13. 2.

What he saith next, is both ridiculous and contrary to Holy Scripture, that we *Cannot* perceive, that our Saviour intended that his Gospel Church should be national. Did not Christ command his Apostles to go and Preach the Gospel to all Nations, and Baptize them into his Holy Profession? And when a whole Nation was converted, did not they unite into a National Church, by the Direction of the Spirit of God? Did they fall in pieces into divers Modes and Forms of Worship? or rather, Did they not all agree into one Method of divine Service? Which is the most commendable, and the most agreeable with Christianity, and with the Intent and Design of Christ in our Redemption; Union and Unity; Order and Conformity; or Division and Separation, into divers Congregations, Forms and Methods? Are not the Churches of Christ beyond the Seas *National*? Is it peculiar to our Church to be so? He quarrels with the General and Universal Constitution of all Foreign and Christian Churches, that are National, where the Members are not suffer'd to vary nor dissent from the prescribed Orders. The Reasons that he gives against a *National Gospel Church*, are weak and impertinent; *Because Christ would have begun to build it in that Form himself.* Christ, during his abode on Earth, held Communion with the *Jewish National Church*; therefore was no Enemy to that

Con-

256 *A Vindication of Infant-Baptism,*
Constitution. And tho' he did not himself
build his Church in that Form amongst the
Gentiles, his Apostles and their Successors
have appointed that Method; for we read
of the converted Kingdoms, that agreed into
a *National Church*, and a *National Form* of
Worship. Again, he saith, We cannot
think Christ's Gospel Church to be *National*,
Because he signifies his Doctrine would be oppo-
sed with Fire and Sword, &c. because if it were
so, it must expect to be freed from Persecution
before Christ come; because she must in such a Case
have Laws made to establish her, because none are
to be admitted Members of the Gospel Church,
but such as manifest some Signs of being regene-
rate, and born again, &c. p. 105. From these
erroneous, weak, and false Suppositions, this
friendly Apostle of the *Anabaptists*, con-
cludes the Church of *England*, is not the true
Church of Christ.

The *Third Cause* of his Friendly Separation
is, *Because they cannot be assur'd by any means,*
that the Church of England hath true Baptism;
and where this is wanting, there can be no true
Church. To this Exception I have sufficiently
answer'd, That we have a true Baptism ac-
cording to Christ's Institution; That both
the Subject and the Mode, are agreeable with
the *Holy Scriptures*, with the Practice of all
the Churches of Christ of all Ages and
Nations; That our Administration is per-
form'd by the Lawful Ministers of Christ, to
which the *Anabaptists* cannot justly pretend.

I shall only add a Word in relation to a sup-
 posed Letter of Dr. Barlow to Mr. Tombs,
 where the Language is so like that of an
Anabaptist, that either Dr. Barlow was lean-
 ing to that Perswasion when he writ it, or
 the Letter is false and supposititious: The
 first may be gather'd from his sayings, *That*
he was a Friend to the main of his Opinion; *That*
he had not yet seen anything like an Argument
for Infant-Baptism; and, *That there is neither*
Precept nor Practice in Scripture for it, &c. 'Tis
 strange, that Dr. Barlow never understood
 the expresse Command of Christ to bring
 Infants to him, and into his Church and
 Covenant by Baptism. That he never read
 of *Origen's* Testimony for Infant-Baptism,
 before the Two Hundred Years after Christ
 were elapsed, and before *Tertullian's* days.
 'Tis strange, that he should despise such con-
 vincing Arguments for this Observation of
 Dr. Hammond and Mr. Baxter, as are to be
 read in their Books. 'Tis likewise very
 strange, that he should declare so expressly
 against the Articles and Belief of the Church
 of England, whereof he then professed him-
 self a Member, and since was a *Bishop*;
 amongst which Articles are these Words,
that Baptism of Children is to be retain'd in the
Church, as most agreeable with Christ's Institu-
tion. Is it not strange, that so learned a
 Man should tell us, that *St. Austine* was the
 first for the necessity of Infant-Baptism,
 whereas *Cyprian*, and all the Fathers before
 him,

258 *A Vindication of Infant-Baptism,*

him, urg'd and preach'd the necessity, in case of apparent Death. For Dr. Taylor's favouring of their Doctrine, I find many of this Sect cite him and his Arguments, which he dashes out with one Stroke of his Pen, by saying, *That for his part, he believes Infant-Baptism to be a Truth, see The Justif. Inf. Baptism, Printed 1652.* And he repented to have given the Enemy by his Wit and Reasoning, so great an Advantage against this Gospel Truth, and the Right of Infants. But if an Angel from Heaven, should speak against our plain *Scripture-Proof* for Infant-Baptism, we are warranted by St. Paul to reject him as accursed, *Gal. 1. 9* From thence, and from the Usage of all Churches and Ages, I have sufficiently proved, That Infants are to be Baptized, and that Sprinkling of Water is a Lawful and Evangelick Baptism. Therefore what *Jo. Hooke* teacheth, tho' an Apostle, for Adult-Baptism, and Dipping to be essential, is already answer'd and evidenced to be erroneous and false.

The *Fourth Cause* of his friendly Separation, *We cannot find such Officers in God's Word as we find in that Church, Lord-Primates, Archbishops, Lord-Bishops, Provincial-Bishops, Diocesan-Bishops, Arch-Deacons, &c.* Were there any thing in the Function of these Officers contrary to the Word of God, it might administer cause of Exception against them but as some of these Titles have been be-

stow'd

How'd upon them, with their Revenues, by the Liberality of Princes, to distinguish their Order, Dignity, and Pre-eminence in the Church, 'tis a very frivolous Reason, merely for their Title sake, not met with in scripture, to fall off from an Orthodox Church, whereof they are Members and Dignitaries. Our *Apologist* is so great a Friend to them, that he judges, that by Humane Authority, they may lawfully be displaced and cashier'd, as they were by the Violence of the Actors, in our late Civil War; for which, in their first Confession of Faith, the *Anabaptists* applauded them.

The *Fifth Cause* of Separation is, That the Church of *England* teaches, That such Infants are regenerate that are Baptized, which they can never believe, &c. Now if the Baptism of our Church be a Lawful Baptism, according to Christ's Institution, as I have proved it to be, and Infants are thereby, by his Command, enter'd into a New State, a State of Grace and Salvation, they may be said to be regenerated or born again of Water, and we charitably believe, of the Spirit too. Therefore *J. H.* rejects not only the Doctrine of the Church of *England*, but also of the Holy Scriptures, that positively affirm, That they are baptized for the Remission of Sin, and to be enter'd into Covenant with God, which is the Regeneration understood by our Church, *Acts 2. 38. John 3. 5.*

The *Sixth* Cause of Separation is, *On strange Forms of Worship, and multitude of Ceremonies, which, he saith, they cannot find in the Gospel.* I answer : What seems strange to a Proud Self-conceited Schismatick, appears not so to an Humble and Devout Christian that can submit to, and be benefited by our Religious Forms of Worship ; and both they and the reasonable Ceremonies enjoyn'd by our Church, are for Decency, Uniformity according to the Scripture Rules, and to Edification of Souls, and the Honour and Worship of God. For the bowing to the Altar, is a false Notion, for Men bow only towards the Altar ; 'tis no where commanded tho' practis'd by some with a good Intent. And towards the *East*, he compares it to the Idolatry of those who worship'd the Sun towards the *East*, *Ezek. 8. 16.* which none of our Church is guilty of : Here *J. H.* flanders our People. The second childish Exception is, the Ring in Marriage, which he saith, is used in the Name of the Holy Trinity ; but he there mistakes our Rubrick, for by that Ceremony the Woman is wedded to the Man, and endowed with all his Goods, in the Name of the Father, &c. Another Scare-crow that frights *J. H.* from us, is the Ancient, Significant and Primitive Sign of the Cross, which I have already vindicated in my first *Antidote*.

The *Last* Reason of Separation is, The great want of Discipline in the Church of
England,

England, which indeed is more exactly enjoin'd by our Canons, than practis'd by the Officers. But in this Accusation J. H. acts as the proud *Pharisee* of the Gospel, who extoll'd the Purity and Devout Performances of himself and Order, but despised the sinful *Publican*. It were to be wish'd, that all Christian Professors were Saints; but we cannot expect it, while Satan hath so great a Liberty in the World, to sow Tares in the Lord's Field. The Time of exact Discipline and Separation is at the End of the World, *Matth.* 13. 39, 40. At present we must imitate our Lord, who admitted into his Company, and associated with Publicans, Sinners, Scribes, and Pharisees. To separate from a Church only because of ungodly Members in it, is an Act of a proud, conceited, pharisaical Spirit, not justifiable before God or Men. But if we inquire into their pure and holy Congregations, we shall meet with some as fully debauch'd and villainous as any can be. What Reason have they to glory in their Discipline and Sanctity of their Professors, while we can produce amongst 'em Drunkenness, Whoredom, and Polygamy, and other notorious Crimes, masked under an Appearance of Holiness, whereof their noted Teachers are guilty: For Instance, one ——— *Alc—ck* a late Teacher at *Deptford*, gave the Pox to his Maid, as she confessed to a Doctor of Physick before her Death. Another heavenly Preacher, one *W. Ra—l—ns*

262 *A Vindication of Infant-Baptism,*
a Baker of *Bury*, hath Two Wives, &c. could prove a Hundred more such Practice amongst them. Now suppose some of these Exceptions were real, Are they sufficient to justify before God, his and his Brethren's Apostacy from a Church of Christ, where the Word of God is purely preach'd, and the Sacraments duly administred according to Christ's Institution; where nothing is enjoy'd but what is innocent, harmless, just, orthodox and good, tending to the Glory of God, and the Salvation and Comfort of Souls? Therefore the Separation of the *Anabaptists* is unreasonable, unwarrantable, and contrary to these Texts of *Holy Scripture*, Rom. 12. 16. and 15. 6. 2 Cor. 13. 11. Phil. 1. 27. Gal. 5. 20. Eph. 4. 3. Rom. 16. 17. 1 Cor. 1. 3, 11. If there were any thing practised or appointed in our Church, that might render the Professors in Communion with it Criminals before God, there might be a Reason for a Breach of Unity; but we deny any such Practice to be amongst us. Let therefore the Reader judge, upon what frivolous, childish, and foolish Accounts, these Men divide from our Church: And let them consider, whether these Causes, as they pretend for a Separation from us, will be allowed as sufficient at the last Tribunal, before an Impartial Judge; when their bare Thoughts, their mistaken Consciences, and frivolous Exceptions, will not pass for lawful Pleas when they might have been better informed from

from God's Holy Word ; and when their
guiltinous Crimes of Apostacy, and their ad-
hering to the Spirit of Error, which have
drawn after them many dismal Consequences,
shall be charg'd upon them ; when the Dam-
nation of so many miserable Souls, that by
these Divisions and Heresies have fallen into the
Devil's Snares, and are ruin'd for all Eternity,
shall be requir'd at their Hands ; and when
all their Lying and Forgery, with which they
support their Party and Errors, shall be de-
tected, and appear without disguise or mask
before Men and Angels.

Mr. Ben.

Mr. Ben. Keach's Rector Rectified, a Book against Infant-Baptism, briefly tried by the Word of God and Reason and proved to be false and erroneous.

I Find in this Gentleman, the same bold insolent, presumptuous, false, and deceitful Spirit, discoverable all over his Book, with this difference between Mr. Hooke and him that this Spirit is bare fac'd, but the other appears mask'd with a Vizard of Friendship. 'Twas written in Opposition to a Reverend Divine of our Church Mr. William Burket Rector of Mildin in Suffolk, and his Arguments for Infant-Baptism. He seems to triumph and glory in his Perswasion, grounded upon these false Suppositions, *That there is no Precept in the Word of God for Infant-Baptism nor Example for such a Practise; That Baptism is rightly to be administred only by Dipping, and not by Sprinkling, &c.* These and other groundless and unreasonable Suppositions he often repeats, and takes for granted; but as I have already proved the contrary, I shall examine some other of his Mistakes, to confirm my former Arguments for Infant-Baptism, and our Mode of Administration. He saith p. 2. *I deny that Baptism is any where in God's Word call'd a Seal of the Covenant of Grace, &c.* Tho' it be not so call'd there, the Intent and Purpose of its

Institu

Institution by Christ, is to be a visible and outward Seal of our Profession, and of our Christianity, and a Seal from God, by the Hand and Mouth of his Minister, of our Reception into his Church and Covenant. As it is appointed by Christ, to be instead of Circumcision, and as that was a Sign and a Seal to *Abraham* of God's Favour, and of the Righteousness of Faith, Baptism being design'd for the same Purpose, visibly to enter us into Covenant with God, 'tis consequently both a Sign and Seal, and as our Catechism expresses. *A Pledge to assure us thereof*, Rom. 4. 11. Therefore to correct his Mistake, Baptism of Water is an outward Seal not of inward Grace, but of the Promises of God annex'd to this Ordinance, and of outward Covenant Blessings, the inward being sealed unto us by the Baptism of the Spirit.

He denies, p. 4 that Baptism succeeds in the room of Circumcision, contrary to the exprefs Words of Christ, *Go and Disciple all Nations*, Baptizing or by Baptism, &c. As during the *Mosaick* Covenant, Men and Infants were discipled, or profelyted by Circumcision; so *Matth.* 28. 19. by the Command of our Lord they are now to be profelyted by Baptism, and enter'd into his Church by that outward Ceremony, *Acts* 2. 41. The Reasons that he musters up to contradict, are frivolous, impertinent, and some false, as *That Baptism is a Sign of the Peculiar Spiritual Privileges made to Saints, as such, and no others.*

M

E y

266 *A Vindication of Infant-Baptism,*

By the Command of Christ it belongs to all his outward Disciples, *Matth.* 28. to all that profess their Belief, *Mark* 16. 16. to all such as are to come to him, *Luke* 18. 16. as we have sufficiently proved. 'Tis a Sign of our Admission into Christ's Church, where all are not Saints, but a mixed Multitude. He reckons up the Differences between Circumcision and Baptism to little purpose, for he confesseth, *p. 6. That Circumcision was anciently the initiating Ordinance, and Baptism is so now in Gospel Times, &c.* Here he contradicts himself, and what he hath formerly said; for after he had spent his Wit, to prove that Baptism succeeds not in the room of Circumcision, he acknowledges it does, for the chief Purpose we alledge it, namely, To be an Initiating Ordinance into the Christian Church, as that was into the Jewish. And he furnishes us with an Argument against his Perswasion; for those who had a Right to be then initiated into the Covenant by God's exprefs and positive Command, without a Repeal, have a Right still; but young Infants of Believing Parents had then such a Right, which was never repealed: Therefore they have a Right still to be enter'd into God's Covenant, and to the Promise that was then made to *Abraham* and his Seed, as 'tis understood by *St. Paul, Rom.* 9. 8. *They which are the children of the flesh, these are not the children of God; but the children of the promise are counted for the Seed. So Gal.* 3. 16.

16. *The Promises were made to Abraham and to his Seed, which is Christ.* In him therefore Christian Children have a Title and Claim to this Promise, and consequently to the Covenant unto which 'tis annex'd. There needs no other Declaration of the Will of God in this Case; but if our Adversaries require a positive Command to bring our Children into Covenant, we can produce Christ's express Orders: *To suffer little children to come unto him, &c.* and the Reason, because *Of such is the Kingdom of God.* Now the Kingdom of God can belong to none but to those within the Covenant, who are in Christ.

He tells us next, p. 11. *That Baptism and Circumcision were both in force together.* I confess the Baptism of *John* was, but not that of *Christ*. And he falsely saith, p. 17. *That the New Testament is wholly silent in the Case of Infant-Baptism, and Church-Membership;* but I have proved and evidenc'd the contrary. 'Tis plain and intelligible to us, tho' not to the wilfully blind *Anabaptists*, in the Eight Arguments before mention'd, drawn from Holy Scripture, That in the Gospel 'tis Christ's express Command, that Infants of Believing Parents should be enter'd into his Church and Kingdom by Baptism, as the Children of *Abraham* were enter'd into Covenant with God by Circumcision. We borrow not therefore our Children's Baptism from the Jewish Practice, of Baptizing all Children of their Profelytes, as he would have the

World believe, and 'tis to be proved they did, but from Christ's Institution and positive Order, so often repeated. And I would have our Adversaries know, that the Differences between the Gospel Covenant and the *Jewish*, do not in any respect incapacitate our Infants from an Entrance into a Covenant with God, as the former were. Therefore all Mr. *Keach*'s arguing, and long discourse, to invalidate the Argument drawn from Infant Circumcision, to prove our Infant-Baptism, is frivolous and vain; for if the Mercy and Goodness of God to our Infants are the same, and as inclinable to do them good, as to the Children of *Abraham*; and if they are as capable of Covenanting with God as the former, and as fit for the receiving what Blessings their Redeemer is pleased to bestow upon them, all other Differences between the Legal and Evangelick Covenants are insignificant, and no Impediments to their Reception by Baptism.

Why Christ made so little mention of the Enrolling Infants into his Covenant by his New Sign and Seal, Mr. *Burket* saith very well, that it was the indisputable Practice amongst God's People then, to admit them by Circumcision, and there was no need to declare his Mind in this Case in relation to them, more plainly than he had done before, when he order'd, *To suffer little Children to come to him, &c.* To which *B. K.* returns

Four impertinent Answers: *First*, Our Saviour knew that Infant-Baptism would be denied; If he would have had it practised in his Church, he would have Commanded it in exprefs Terms. What a weak and unsettled reasoning is this, which may be turned either way as a Weathercock? For we may as well say, because he knew it would be disputed to prevent Controversies, if he would not have had Infant Baptism in his Church, he would have forbidden it; and there is a greater probability for our Reasoning than for that of *B. K's*, because it was then the constant Usage of God's Church, to admit innocent Babes of Believers into covenant with God, and grant them the Seal. It was therefore likely that he would have prohibited it, if he had disliked it, and there was then a greater need for a Prohibition and Repeal of that Right, Infants then enjoy'd without controul, than for a Command to continue the Usage, which none denied them at that Time. *2dly*, *Why should the Baptizing of Believers be so clearly spoken of in the New Testament, if a being in the Covenant was a sufficient ground to baptize them without a positive Precept?* And why was not the same mention'd in respect of Infants? I answer, *B. K.* is in a great Error. Neither Believers nor Infants are within the Covenant, till they be enter'd by Christ's and God's initiating Ordinance; and that there was no Precept for Baptizing Infants, as well

270 *A Vindication of Infant-Baptism,*

as the Adult Believers, I have proved it a notorious Untruth. But when the Apostles received a Command from their Master, to go and preach the Gospel to all Nations, it was needful to declare to them upon what Terms they were to be admitted into his Church and Kingdom, and receive the Badge of Admission. 3dly, He insists next upon the Difference of the Church of the *Jews* which, he says, was National; but that of the Gospel, Congregational. This last Position is false, and cunningly insinuated by B. K. and his Brethren, to make the World believe, that their Independant and Irregular Congregations are establish'd according to Christ's Model. Therefore he argues upon the changing the State of the Church, the Gospel Dispensation requir'd a positive Command to baptize Infants, which we judge we have in Christ's fore-mention'd Invitation and Order. 4thly, *That Christ, by establishing a New Covenant, dissolved the Old, with all the Rites, &c.* But whatever he dissolved, he did not come to dissolve or disanul the Privileges of his People; but to grant them greater and larger: Therefore Infants were not to be deprived of those Blessings they enjoy'd before his coming. What he saith next to the second Chapter, depends upon this false Position, That Christ never express'd his Mind in the *New Testament*, that Infants should be Baptized; but I have proved the contrary. I meet here so many Errors in Divinity, so many

many Mistakes and Misinterpretations of Holy Scripture, that I cannot number them all. He supposes that the Baptism of *John*, which I have already observed to belong, and proper only to Adult Persons, was the same with that of Christ; which is false, as may be proved from *Acts* 19. 4, 5. The Baptism of *John*, was no Introduction into God's Covenant, but a Passage from the Jewish State into an Evangelick; neither was it administred in the Name of the *Father*, of the *Son*, &c. as Christ's is. The Doctrine of the Trinity, tho' revealed obscurely in the *Old Testament*, and known to the Learned, was more clearly discover'd in the *New*, and plainly manifested, by the Dedication of our Persons and Children, to the Honour and Service of the Father, of the Son, and Holy Ghost.

He saith, p. 39. that Mr. *Burke* is mistaken, when he calls Circumcision a Seal of the Covenant made with *Abraham*; whereas 'tis so understood by God, at the first Institution, *Gen.* 17. 10, 11. *This is my covenant, which ye shall keep between me and you, and thy seed after thee. Every male-child among you, shall be circumcised, &c. And it shall be a token of the Covenant betwixt me and you.* How is it a Covenant? 'Tis only the Sign, Seal, and Token of it. Thus he denies that Baptism is a Seal of the Covenant of Grace, under the Gospel. By this it plainly appears, that B. K. understood not the Nature and Cir-

cumstances of the Gospel Covenant, whereof the Baptism of Water is an outward and visible Seal and Pledge, by virtue of Christ's Institution and Promise. He tells us, p. 4. *That the Covenant made with Abraham was a mix'd Covenant, that respected both the Natural and Spiritual Children.* But he denies, p. 43. *That the Contract made with Abraham, was made with the Natural Seed of Believing Gentiles.* I answer, If God promised to be the God of *Abraham*, because of his Faith, Believing *Gentiles* and their Seed, may justly claim the same Right to this Promise, by reason of their Belief and Covenant with him in Christ, who is the true Seed of *Abraham* intended in that Promise, as *St. Paul* affirms, *Gal. 3. 16.* Therefore that Promise made to *Abraham*, was an Evangelick Promise, wherein all that are related to Christ, and are true Believers, are in the same Condition as *Abraham* was; and their Seed have an equal Right to God's Favour and Spiritual Mercies. Why they should be deprived of them, our Adversaries could never give any Reason; or why they should not be admitted into Covenant with God. *B. K.* proposes an improper Example, of a Man making Two Wills, as God Two Covenants; and that unless a Legacy be expressed in the last Will, it being mention'd in the first, is not recoverable by Law. The Comparison is not equal, for God hath not alter'd his Will, as to the Favour and Blessings granted to the Faithful
and

and their Children, under the Gospel, who are not abridg'd or deprived of them that were formerly enjoyed ; God is an unchangeable Being, and unchangeable in his Promises and Favours to Men, till they forfeit them. But I cannot but take notice here, how *B. K.* as the rest of his *Sect*, labours to confound the Questions, and perplex the clearest Truths with intricate Notions, and far-fetch'd Distinctions, and generally they discourse of Divine Matters as blind Men of Colours, by hear-say. He labours to prove that the Seed of Believing *Gentiles*, are not concern'd in that Promise made to *Abraham* : *I will be the God of thee, and of thy Seed after thee.* Whereas they are in the same Capacity as *Abraham's* Natural Seed, Children of Believers, as *Abraham* was, and in Christ their Head and Founder ; they may be call'd the Spiritual Seed, descended from Persons in covenant with God ; and why he should not be their God, as well as he was of *Abraham's* Seed, for the same Reason of their Father's Faith, none can tell. Now this Expression necessarily requires their admittance into covenant with him, and consequently to the Seal of it, which, under the Gospel, is Baptism, as Circumcision was formerly. As God required the Seal of Circumcision to be applied to Infants with this grievous Penalty, in case of Omission, to be cut off from their People ; so he requires Baptism by the same Law that is in force as to us now, in relation

274 *A Vindication of Infant-Baptism,*

to this Administration : Therefore there is no absurdity to say, that 'tis in the Power of Men, to bring their Children into covenant with God, or into the ordinary and appointed Way or Method of Salvation. God may save them without ; but we have no Promise that he will. He requires our Compliance and Obedience to his Divine Institutions, unto which his Promises and Blessings are annexed. But of this I have already spoken so fully, that I purposely omit an Answer to all Mr. K's weak Arguments, and frivolous Exceptions, with which he labours to prove our Children have no Right to be enter'd into covenant with God under the Gospel, tho' Christ hath declared the contrary, by saying, *That of such is the Kingdom of God,* and that they are to be brought, and to come to him, to be enter'd into that Blessed Kingdom and Society. To all the rest of his Book I have given already a sufficient Answer elsewhere, in the foregoing Pages. I shall only examin his Objection to Christ's Invitation and Command, *To suffer little Children to come unto him, for of such, &c.* B. K. saith, that during Christ's Abode on Earth, there were other ordinary Ways of coming to him, than by Admission into his Church. What is this to the Invitation of Infants to come to him ? I have already observ'd, that Christ was departing out of the World ; That these Infants were *Jewish* Infants, within the Covenant by Circumcision ; That they had

on other way, after our Saviour's Death, to come to him, but by Baptism; and, That he left this as a standing Order to his Ministers, *To suffer little Children, such little Children of Believing Parents, to come to him, and adds the Reason, For of such is the Kingdom of God; That they were fit in that tender Age, to become Subjects of his Blessed Kingdom.* But before they could be reckon'd or admitted to that Honour and Privilege, they were to come to him, which since his Departure they cannot do by any other Way, but by Baptism. 'Tis true, Christ might own these *Jewish Children*, who had been Circumcised Subjects of his Kingdom; but Children in the State of Nature, polluted with Original Sin, cannot be reckon'd Subjects of ~~Christ's Kingdom~~, till they be brought to the Initiating Ordinance of Baptism, to that Laver of Regeneration. If he did not Baptize these, 'twas because Baptism, as I have already said, I mean the Baptism of Christ, was not a standing Ordinance in his Church, till after his Resurrection. Therefore the major of *B. K's* Argument is false, and we utterly deny it. *If Children were brought to Christ, and he did not baptize them, then we must not.* For the Time of Christ's Baptism was to begin, when he had by his Death put an End to the Rites of the Levitical Law, and establish'd a New Church and Kingdom, by his Glorious Resurrection.

Then

276 *A Vindication of Infant-Baptism, &c.*

Then Circumcision was to cease, and Christ's Baptism to take place; Then Children and Infants were to come to him to be Subjects of his Kingdom, which they cannot be, unless they be initiated by Baptism. To all his other Reasonings I have fully answer'd, and why we don't admit Infants to the Lord's Supper, I have spoken sufficiently.

of the Christian Sabbath appointed by Christ, and observed by his Holy Apostles, and since by the Church of God in all Ages.

THE Reason of my examining this Controversy next, about the *Christian* and *Jewish Sabbath*, is the Kindness that I have for my Adversary, whom I understand to be a *Jewish Sabbatarian*, or a *Seventh-day-Baptist*, as I am inform'd. I am very willing to cure this Judgment of that Error, as well as of the former, if it be possible; and as there are a number of others infected with that Perswasion, my Reasons for our Christian Practice, may not be unuseful to them of the same Sect. Now 'tis expressly declared in the Confession of the *Anabaptists*, Ch. 22. N. 7. *As it is the Law of Nature, that in general a Proportion of Time by God's appointment be set a part for the Worship of God, so by his Word, in a positive, moral, and perpetual Commandment, binding all Men in all Ages, he hath particularly appointed One Day in Seven for a Sabbath, to be kept holy unto him, which from the Beginning of the World to the Resurrection of Christ, was the last Day of the Week; and from the Resurrection of Christ, was changed into the first Day of the Week, which is called the Lord's-day; and is to be continued to the End of the World, as the Christian Sabbath; the observation of the last*
Day

Day of the Week being abolished. This Article is agreeable with our Church's Doctrine and Practice. If all the *Anabaptists* were of this Perswasion, there needed no Arguments to be used in this Matter ; but these Men who have forsaken our Church, are now divided amongst themselves in this Point ; for some of them stiffly maintain that the *Jewish Sabbath* is yet to be kept, and God's Command in force in relation to the *Seventh-day*. Against these my purpose is to examine and resolve these Three Questions by Holy Scripture and Reason.

First, Whether *Christian Professors* are now obliged by any Natural Law or Precept, to observe the *Seventh-day* of the Creation ?

Secondly, Whether that Day be not changed by a Divine Authority into the *Christian Sabbath* ?

Thirdly, What Obligations we have religiously to keep that Day, in Commemoration of the Resurrection of our Glorious Redeemer ?

Reason and the Law of Nature teach us to Adore and Worship a Superior Being, upon whom we depend, and from whom we daily receive our Life and Subsistence, and to offer to him a Part of our Enjoyments, as an acknowledgment, that all proceeds from him, who is the Giver of every good Gift. The same Law directs us to set a-part some part of our Time for this Worship, to solemnize it,

and perform it with more respect, and in manner more becoming the Glory and Majesty of our God. All civilized Nations have had their set Times of Adoration of their Gods, and *Plutarch* speaks, that amongst the *Grecians* and *Romans* the Seventh-day was observ'd. It seems they were not ignorant of that Day, that God had chosen at the Creation of the World, to sanctify it, and 'tis probable that this was a Tradition derived to them from former Generations, with which they were acquainted. *Moses* has set upon Record God's first Decree concerning the Seventh-days's Sabbath, *Gen. 2. 2, 3.* And on the seventh day God ended his work, which he had made; and he rested on the seventh day from all his work which he had made, and God blessed the seventh day, and sanctified it, because that in it he had rested from all his work which God created and made. It seems by these Words, that God fixed and appointed the Devotions of Men, that is, the solemn Worship of him to this certain Day, that was the Conclusion of the Creation. And accordingly, when Men began to multiply upon the Earth, and *Enos* the Son of *Seth* was born, Men began to call upon the name of the Lord; that is, to assemble and unite in a Congregation, and publickly to praise and glorify God, which was probably on this Seventh Day, *Gen. 4. 26.* Therefore since God had chosen that Day, by setting it a-part, and by a particular Blessing had sanctified it above all

all other Days, 'twas the Duty of all true Servants of God at that Time, and in the following Ages, to conform themselves to the Holy Example of their Creator, and not to vary from it without his Warrant. For that reason we find this Day confirm'd by God in the *Moral Law*, and he speaks of it as of a *Day* well known to the *Israelites* with an Emphatick *Memento*, *Remember that thou keep holy the sabbath day*, &c. Four Reasons are in this Command, to enforce it, and oblige his People to the observation of that particular Day: *First*, God's Command to the Men of that Time to take notice of it, and free it from Oblivion. *2dly*, Because 'tis the *Sabbath* of the Lord our God. *A Day* that he had set a-part and chosen for the Celebration of his Praise and Worship; *a Day*, that he claim'd, and had appropriated to himself amongst all other Days, as his *Day*; and the rather Men ought to yield that Day to God, because of his liberal allowance of Six Days, granted to them for their necessary Occupations. *3dly*, Because he had finished his glorious Works of Creation, and rested on that Day. Therefore to solemnize the Memory of the compleating of so noble a Fabrick, and of God's fetching it and Mankind out of the dark *Abyss* and *Chaos*, they could do no less than sanctify that Day, in glorifying the Omnipotency and Goodness of God, who had given them a Being. *Lastly*, Because he had vouchsafed a Blessing to that Day,

Day, and had hallowed it, separated it from the rest and ordinary Occupations, and promised his Divine Benediction to the due observance of it. All these were reasons sufficient to oblige the Men of the first World and the next Ages, and under the *Mosaick Law*, to be diligent in keeping the *Seventh Day Holy*, and in dedicating it entirely to the Service of God. Therefore 'tis often named the *Lord's Sabbath*, and a Religious observation of it strictly enjoyn'd by *Moses* and the *Prophets*.

But in this Precept there is some part *Moral* and of a perpetual continuance in the Churches of God, and some part *Ceremonial* and *Typical*. The *Moral* part, to which we are all oblig'd, is the sanctifying of *One Day* in Seven, and employ it in Acts of Religion and Charity, and in divine Meditations and Prayers. In that Day we are to rest from our daily works, allow likewise a Rest to our Servants and Cattle that they may reap the benefit of this Cessation from Labour, granted to them by the Divine appointment. The *Ceremonial* part consists in an over strict observation of the *Seventh Day*, enjoyned by *Moses* to the Children of *Israel*, with that severity, that the gathering of a few Sticks was Punish'd with Stoning to Death; and nothing was to be done that might disturb their Rest. The *Typical* part was to represent by that extraordinary Repose of that Day, the Glorious Rest that we should enjoy under

under the Dominion and Empire of the Messiah: Therefore the *Seventh Day* of the *Jews* was both *Ceremonial* and *Typical*. And as all *Levitical Types* were no longer to continue, but till the *Death* and *Resurrection* of the Messiah; This amongst the other *Types* had then an end, and God's Command was no longer binding to us Christians, for the keeping the *Jewish Sabbath*. And this I prove,

First, Because, tho' God from the beginning had Sanctified that day in remembrance of the Creation, he never Commanded the observation of it but to his People, the Posterity of *Abraham*, that they might attend upon their Sacrifices, Burnt-Offerings, and other Acts of Religion, all which are now totally abolish'd, and therefore the day design'd for that purpose ceaseth, to give place to another.

Secondly, St. Paul tells the *Coloss. c. 2. v. 17.* That the Sabbath Days were a shadow of things to come; but the Body is of Christ. What need of the shadows, when we enjoy the Substance? This Text proves that the *Jewish Sabbath* being a *Typical Representation* of our Blessings under the Gospel, it was to continue no longer than to the Death of Christ, who is the end of the Law, *Rom. 10. 4.* that is, of the *Levitical, Ceremonial* and *Typical Law*. The *Seventh Day* being a part, the same the Apostle expressly declares *Heb. 7. 12.* That there is of necessity made a Change

Change of that Law, because the Priesthood was changed, therefore it is no longer to be observed by us Christians.

Thirdly, God not only allows six Days in that Commandment, to employ our selves in our necessary Works; but enjoyns us, *Six Days shalt thou Labour*. If therefore, as we shall prove next, *The Jewish Sabbath* is chang'd into the Christian by the Order of Christ and his Holy Apostles, and so understood by all the Churches since his Death and Passion, we are no longer to keep that Day, but Religiously to observe the Day of our Saviour's Resurrection. But had we no other Arguments and Proofs to bring for our abolishing the *Jewish Sabbath* than what the *Old Testament* affords, we should find our selves at a loss; for there is nothing more strictly enjoyn'd; no Precept more often repeated; nor none more frequently enforced with Promises and Threatnings than the Celebration of that Day. We must therefore enquire from the *New Testament* how that Day so solemnly enjoyn'd by God, comes to be alter'd; and by what Authority the Lord's Day is substituted in its stead: For that purpose we are to take notice that Christ reforms the *Jews*, Matth. 12. 8. *That the Son of Man was Lord even of the Sabbath Day*; therefore he had a Power to continue, or to change it as he saw convenient. This is the necessary consequence of that Dominion, which he claims over that Primitive Ordinance

nance of God. Now according to that Authority, and all Power committed to him by the Father, that he hath enjoyned the observation of the first Day of the Week in Memory of his Glorious Resurrection, may appear by the Testimony of the Holy Scriptures, and the practice of the Holy Apostles who were met together on that Day Christ appear'd to them, *John* 20. 19. And we find *St. Paul* and the Disciples of *Troas* met together on the first Day of the Week on the Christian Sabbath, to break Bread to Celebrate the Remembrance of the Death of Christ in the Communion, and this Apostle Preaching amongst them, *Acts* 20. 7. This first day of the Week is expressed by *μῆρ τῶν σαββάτων*, the word *ἡμέρα* is there to be understood. And the Day of our Saviour's Resurrection is express'd in the same Terms, *Mark* 16. 2. *λίαν πρωὶ τῆ μιᾶς σαββάτου*, which words are expounded in the first verse of *Matthew* 28. *In the end of the Sabbath as it began to dawn towards the first day of the Week, &c.* So *Mark* 16. *When the Sabbath Day was past, and very early in the Morning, &c.* 'Twas therefore the Custom of the Christian and Gentile Churches to observe that day in Acts of Devotion, as we may understand from the *1 Corinth. c. 16. 2.* On the first Day of the Week, they were to assemble and make Collections of their Charity for the Poor; now it may be question'd why our Blessed wise Lord gave not an express order

order upon Record, for the Observation of this Day of the Resurrection; but left it to his Apostles management, and delivered to them his Will by word of Mouth. It was because of the high Opinion the *Jews* had of their *Sabbath Day*, and of their aversion to any Change of that Day; therefore to give them no distast nor prejudice against his Religion upon that account, Christ left it to the Prudence of his Apostles, to alter it by degrees, and oblige the Converted *Gentiles* more easily to be perswaded to the observation of this Day of his Resurrection, that by their example and practice, they who believed amongst the *Jews*, might in time be induced to the same observation; for as the other Nations had no such value for this Primitive and Levitical Law, they could more easily be prevail'd upon than the *Jews*, to neglect it. Was not this the cause of that Nations quarrel with the *Protomartyr Steven*, and the reason of their Accusation? We have heard him say, that this *Jesus of Nazareth shall Destroy this Place, and shall Change the Customs which Moses deliver'd to us*, *Acts. 6. 14.* This was likewise the principal cause of their Hatred against, and Persecution of *St. Paul*; because he taught the *Christian Gentiles* to observe the Day of Christ's Resurrection instead of the former *Sabbath*, and forbid their Circumcision, of which the believing *Jews* were very fond; Witness the Words of *James*, *Acts 21. 20, 21. Thou seest,*

seest Brother, how many Thousands of Jews there are, which believe, and they are all zealous of the Law, and they are informed of thee, that thou teachest all the Jews, which are among the Gentiles to forsake Moses, saying, That they ought not to Circumcise their Children, neither to walk after the Customs. And amongst these Customs was the observation of the Jewish Sabbath; therefore by the Doctrine and Practice of this Apostle it was chang'd into the Christian, the first Day of the Week.

Secondly, This Day is expressly named by St. John, Revel. 1. 10. *The Lord's Day*, The Day that our Redeemer Challenges to himself as his Day, in which he calls for our Devotions and Respects; a Day that we are never to forget, but always to Celebrate in remembrance of the discharge of our Surety from his Tomb; a Day of Praise and Thanksgiving, because on that Day our Redemption was compleat, our Saviour releas'd out of the Prisons of Death; a Day, in one word, that open'd to us and discover'd to all believing Souls, a Prospect and Assurance of a blessed Immortality, and a perfect Reconciliation with our God. On that Day, the Apostles were met together, and God approved from Heaven the Celebration of that Day by a Miraculous descent of the Holy Ghost upon Christ's Disciples Acts 2. Such a Sanctification of it by the Gift of Tongues and other wonderful Blessings bestowed upon those Primitive Christian's

Christian's, was sufficient to recommend it to the observation of the Posterity, and the Institution of this day instead of the Jewish Sabbath.

Thirdly, The constant observation of this day from the Infancy of Christian Religion, is a slight Argument that it was of a Divine Establishment. All the Churches of the East and West part of the World did always meet together and perform the Service of God on this Day, as may be proved by many passages out of the Fathers, and particularly out of Ignatius, who says, *Let every one that loveth Christ Celebrate the Lord's Day.* And Eusebius, l. 4. c. 25. tells us of Melito, Bishop of Sardis, that he wrote a Treatise of the Lord's Day, when there was a contention at Laodicea raised by some Judaizing Christians about the Sabbath Day. Few of the Ancient and Primitive Writers, when they have occasion offer'd, but mention this day, as a day appointed for the solemn Assemblies of Christians. The Heathens were so well acquainted with this Practice, that they would commonly Question them with this saying, *What, you observe the Lord's Day?* To which the Christian wou'd Answer, *I am a Christian and cannot neglect it.* Nazianzen in the Funeral Oration at his Father's Death, speaks of the observation of the Lord's Day amongst all Christians of that Time. And Justin Martyr declares expressly, That the Christian Assemblies were on Sunday,

Sunday, τῇ τῷ ἁλίῃ ἡμέρᾳ ; and as *Tertullian* interprets it, *Die Solis* ; Likewise *Athanasius* in his Book of the *Sabbath* and *Circumcision* positively affirms the *Jewish Sabbath* to have been abrogated ; and in its stead the Day of the Resurrection of *Christ* to have been established for the Duties of Religion. To these Testimonies we may add the words of the Council of *Laodicea*, older than the *Nicene* mention'd by *St. Basil*, and approved of by the Council of *Chalcedon*. In the 29th Canon 'tis ordered, *That Christian Men may not Judaize, or grow Jews, in making the Saturday or Sabbath-day their Day of Rest ; but they are to Work on that Day, giving the Honour of Celebration to the Lord's Day. And if any in this particular be found to Judaize ; let them be Anathema to God and Christ.* There can be no plainer Testimony than these to witness that the Lord's Day Succeeded the *Jewish Sabbath*, and that as the latter was abolished the former was Religiously kept by all that were named Orthodox Christians. And altho' the *Apostles*, and particularly *St. Paul*, as we read in the *Acts*, went on the *Sabbath Day* to Preach to the *Jews* ; and the Converted *Christians* kept Communion with their Brethren at *Jerusalem*, by frequenting the Temple, the Publick Place of Worship, on the *Seventh Day*. This was practic'd for fear of giving offence to their Nation ; for to avoid all *Schism* and *Division*, and to instruct them in the Doctrines of Christianity

at their Solemn times and places of meetings in their *Synagogues*. But from hence we are not to conclude, The observation of the *Jewish Sabbath* is to be yet continu'd amongst us *Christians*; for we have not the same Reasons as they had to comply with their mistakes and weakness in this Case, for fear of offence, and for the Conversion of any to our Religion: But on the contrary, the keeping of the *Jewish Sabbath* gives a Scandal to the Weak *Christians* amongst us, and is disgraceful to our Profession, and contrary to the Practice of the *Apostles* among other Nations, and of the *Primitive Christians* in general. Therefore from the premises we may conclude, that it was chang'd into our Christian day of Rest, into the *Lord's Day*, that happy Day of the Resurrection of Christ. And tho' there is no express Command to Warrant the change, for the Reasons I have formerly mention'd, the Practice and Custom of the Churches of Christianity in all Nations approved of in the Word of God, is a sufficient warrant for us to observe this Blessed Day in imitation of them.

Fourthly, We are in the last place to examine, what Obligations we have Religiously to keep that Day in Commemoration of the Resurrection of our Glorious Redeemer.

The Licentiousness of this Profane Age, and the mistakes of some late Writers, render this Subject needful to be inquired into;

for whatever the latter may pretend against the *Morality* of the *Lord's Day*, we Christians are oblig'd to observe and dedicate it to Devotion, for the following Reasons and Motives.

First, Because One Day in Seven is claimed by God as his right and due, and by his express Command in the *Moral Law* order'd to be consecrated to his *Honour* and *Service*. Nothing more reasonable, than that we should allow a part of our Time to praise and glorify him for our Beings, and his continual Benefits. All that we enjoy is from the Bounty of our Creator; therefore we can do no less than set apart a Time, to Worship, and Adore him, and acknowledge his manifold liberalities, and innumerable Mercies. The Ignorant Heathens, by the Direction and Light of Nature, are taught this part of the *Moral Law* as I have already intimated. And should we Christians, who are better acquainted with the *Divine Prerogatives*, and our Duties, be less respectful to God than they? Therefore the *Morality* of this Precept is founded upon God's Dominion and Sovereignty, and our Relation to, and dependance upon him, and his continual Providence; for this reason our Duty is immutable, and there can be no dispensation granted for the neglect of this Day, or for the Profanation of it, or the diverting and employing of it to other purposes, than in Acts of Religion and Piety.

Secondly

Secondly, The Honour due to our Redeemer, and to his merciful and noble Performances in our *Redemption* that was this Day accomplished, and the glorious Advantages then procured to us by his Resurrection and Triumph over Death, call upon us to celebrate this Day, which in all probability he order'd to be kept. It was always the custom of the Church of God, to solemnize and perpetuate the Remembrance of glorious Victories, and notable Deliverances. What greater Victory could deserve our Commemoration and Thanksgivings to God, than this of our Redeemer and Surety, releas'd out of the dark Prisons of Death, by the Justice of Heaven? Than this over our most dreadful Enemy, and of all the Infernal Powers? Than this in a Word, that opens to us a Passage, and an Entrance into a blessed *Immortality*? Both the Glory of our Christ, and our own Interest, as well as the Credit of our Profession, challenge the observation of this Day. Therefore by St. *John* 'tis appropriated to him as his Day, a Day that he hath blessed and design'd for the praising and glorifying God, for our present Assurances of Salvation, and for our future Hopes.

Thirdly, We are oblig'd to follow the Examples of the Holy Apostles, and other Orthodox Christians in the Rules and Practices of Religion. They have left us Patterns to imitate and to copy after them: As they

were inspired of God, their Directions are to be obey'd, as proceeding from God, and to be esteem'd of equal Authority, as the exprefs Orders of our Blessed Saviour. The *Primitive Christians* imitated them, as it plainly appears by the Records of *Antiquity*, and we have no reason to dissent from them. So that the Observation of the *Lord's Day*, is derived to us through so many Ages from those infallible Servants and Teachers come from God, who had the Holy Spirit to direct and advise them. Therefore what respect, what veneration and esteem, should we Christians have for this Day, so carefully transmitted to us from Christ's Apostles, for our devout Observation? How ought we to sequester our selves from all worldly Business, and religiously to attend upon the Duties of the Day?

Fourthly, Not only our Obedience to God, our Relation to Christ, our Concernment in our Redemption, and Obligation to imitate the Apostles, but also our own Interest, the Interest of our spiritual Beings, requires our devout Observation of the *Lord's Day*, to instruct the ignorant, to advise the doubtful, to comfort the drooping spirits, to glorify our Maker, and keep us in an awful Reverence of our Great God and Redeemer. Without this Avocation from our worldly Business, we are apt to be too much immersed in temporal Affairs, and to become forgetful of God and Heaven, and of a Preparation for Eternity. This Day is the

the most proper to be set a-part to dispose our Minds for a future State, because it was this Day that gave us the first Assurance of it, and conveyed our Humanity into the Fruition of it. Therefore we are to spend this Day in Divine Meditations, in hearing the Word of God, in Prayers and praising God, and in other Acts of Religion and Charity. For this purpose it was appointed to recall us from the World and worldly Affairs, to the Contemplation of Divine Objects, as Christ declares, *Mark 2. 27. The Sabbath was made for Man, and not Man for the Sabbath.* By which Words we may understand, that, all necessary, convenient, and charitable Deeds may be done on that Day; but as it was instituted principally for the Service of God, to keep up an Appearance of Religion amongst Men, to withdraw them from worldly Affairs, and cause them to mind the Spiritual Concerns; we ought principally to employ it for the End for which it is instituted by God. Therefore if we have any regard for the Good and Welfare of our Souls, we should not neglect the Duties of the Day, and the Purposes for which it was ordain'd.

Fifthly, The terrible Examples of God's Judgments inflicted in former Years, upon those who have contemned the Observation of the *Lord's Day*, should oblige us religiously to keep it; many are recorded by our Forefathers. A certain Person, not regarding
N 3 this

this Blessed Day, caused his Servants to house his Corn on that Day; but how it came to pass 'tis not known, the Fire consumed his Barn, and all the Corn in it, for his Contempt of the *Lord's Day*. A certain *Nobleman* in *Germany* was accustom'd to Hunt on the *Lord's Day*; but while he was following his Sport, his Lady was brought to Bed of a Child, that had the Head, Ears, and Mouth of a Dog, with the Cry of a Hound, to punish him for his Impiety. The Town of *Tiverton* in *Devonshire*, was Twice consumed with Fire, *A. D.* 1598. and 1612. for their labouring on the *Lord's Day*, in erecting their Standings, and preparing for their *Monday's Market*; since, they have been better advised, and have settled the Market on *Tuesday*. In the Year 1583. at a *Bear-baiting* on the *Lord's Day*, in *London*, the Scaffolds fell to the ground, and crush'd to Death Eight Persons, besides many others desperately wounded. At *Risley*, in *Bedfordshire*, at a Play in a Chamber, the Floor fell down and kill'd and wounded many. In a Town of *France*, a certain covetous Woman, that had no respect for the *Lord's Day*, spent it in her daily Occupations in drying of Flax, which on the third *Sunday*, which she used to profane in that Work, the Fire kindled in her Flax, and burnt her and Three of her Children. Divers have been scorch'd to Death with Lightning; others have been struck dead with Thunder; some have, in the midst of their

their Profanation of that *Holy Day*, been punish'd in a remarkable manner, by the Hand of God. And I cannot but observe here, how this Day is abused, neglected, and profaned in the *English Navy* at Sea, without any regard to the Service of God, Prayers, or any other Acts of Religion. If any work is to be perform'd, the Commanders will often appoint that Day to do it, that they might set aside the Devotions of the Church. And I cannot but give here a Relation which I know to be true, of a certain late *Captain* of the *Swiftsure*, who being appointed to sail to *Argiers*, to renew the Peace with those *Pirates*: After he had concluded his Business with those *Infidels*, invited their principal Men on Board his Ship, to a Feast on their *Sabbath-day*, which is *Friday*; they refused to go on that Day, telling him, That it was a Day, that by their *Mahometan Law*, they were to employ in Devotions and Prayer to God, and that they never allowed to themselves on that Day the Liberties of Feasting, and other Licentiousness common on such Occasions. Upon this Refusal, the Captain invited them on our *Sunday*, to come on Board to divert themselves, and borrowed the Musick of the Commander of the Marines, to play to the *Turks*; but he having more sense of Religion than the *Sea Captain*, order'd it to cease, and refused them his Company. By this it appears, that the *Turks* are more strict and zealous Observers of

their *Sabbath*, than some *Christians* are of ours. Truly, we may with reason ascribe the Debaucheries and Profaneness of the Seas, partly to the neglect of Religion on that Day ; for in some Ships I have known Pious *Chaplains*, who have not been suffer'd so much as to offer up publicly the Prayers of the Church ; but instead of God's Service, the Employment of the Principal Officers was Gaming, Drinking, Cursing, Damning, &c. to the great Reproach of our Nation.

Now I have taken notice that most of our Sea-fights have been on that Day, as a Punishment from God, for the Impiety that we are guilty of on that Blessed Day. I could instance many other Examples of the severe Judgments of God, inflicted on the Despisers of the *Lord's Day*, which are sufficient Warnings to Posterity, to reverence the Day of the Lord's Resurrection, and to employ it in Acts of Religion and Piety, in the Service of God, and for the Welfare of our Immortal Souls.

Of Original Sin, with which Infants are Infected.

AMongst the several Sects of the *Ana-baptists*, or Enemies of *Infant-Baptism*, that swarm amongst us, I find some infected with the *Pelagian Heresy*, who deny *Original Sin*. A dangerous Error! condemn'd long ago by the *Christian Church*. To convince these of their Mistakes in this particular, I purpose,

First, To enquire what *Original Sin* is.

Secondly, What Proofs we have from Holy Scripture and Reason, that all Mankind are naturally defiled with it.

Thirdly, What Judgment the Learned World in all Ages have given of this Original Pollution? And what Remedy they judge Christ hath appointed in his Church.

In answer to the first Question. *Original Sin* consists partly in the Guilt of *Adam's* Transgression, imputed unto us by the Justice of God, because of a Lineal Descent from him in the common Order of Generation; and partly in the Corruption of our Natures, originally alienated from God and Goodness, and inclinable to Sin by a tendency of our sensual Appetites, derived to us from our Parents. To this Definition agrees the 19th Article of the Church of *England*. *Original Sin* standeth not in the following of

N 5

Adam;

Adam; but it is the fault and Corruption of the Nature of every Man, that naturally is ingendred of the Offspring of Adam, whereby Man is very far gone from Original Righteousness, and is of his Nature inclin'd to Evil, so that the Flesh lusteth against the Spirit; and therefore in every Person born into this World, it deserveth God's Wrath and Damnation. And this Infection in Nature doth remain in them that are regenerated, whereby the Lust of the Flesh, called in Greek, *Phronema Sarkos*, which some do expound the Wisdom, some Sensuality, some the Affection, some the desire of the Flesh, is not subject to the Law of God. And tho' there is no Condemnation to them that believe and are baptized, yet the Apostle doth confess, that Concupiscence and Lust hath of it self the Nature of Sin. And the Anabaptists Catechism saith, The Covenant being made with Adam, not only for himself, but for his Posterity, all Mankind descending from him by ordinary Generation, sinned in him, and fell with him in his first Transgression; so that the Fall brought Mankind into an Estate of Sin and Misery, &c. Some of our Adversaries here, and in their Confession of Faith, acknowledge Original Sin in Infants, whereby they are out of Communion with God, under his Wrath and Curse, &c. According to this Description, Original Sin consists in Two Particulars: First, In the Imputation of Adam's Disobedience to all his Descendants, as interested in him, the Founder of the Humane

Humane Race. As when a *Noble Man* is degraded from his Nobility by reason of his Rebellion against his Prince, all his Posterity forfeit their Honour in him, and lose their Privilege; so *Adam* lost for himself and all his Progeny, by his eating the Forbidden Fruit, the Favour of his God, and drew upon himself and them, his Lord's Displeasure. Secondly, It consists in a Natural Corruption, convey'd to us from our sinful Parents; which Corruption resides in a disorder of the Animal Part, and a tendency of the Sensual, to Sin and Lust, which draws along with it the Affections of the Mind, being thereunto encouraged by the frequent Temptations that we meet with. Likewise the *Assemblies Catechism*, from which the *Anabaptists* have copy'd theirs, declares, That the sinfulness of that Estate whereunto Man fell, consists in the Guilt of Adam's first Sin, the want of Original Righteousness, and the Corruption of his whole Nature, which is commonly called Original Sin, together with all actual Transgressions which proceed from it; so that all Mankind by the Fall lost Communion with God, are under his Wrath and Curse, and so made liable to all Miseries in this Life, to Death it self, and to the Pains of Hell. I mention these Testimonies, to discover to those Ignorant Souls, who will allow of no Original Sin in Infants, how they disagree with the rest of Dissenters, as well as with our Church's Doctrine. I must also observe that

that the *Assembly of Divines* made *Original Sin* consist in Three Particulars, whereas in reality there are but Two, for the Guilt of *Adam's* Transgression, and the want of Original Righteousness, is one and the same.

Now to prove this *Original Sin*, it will be in vain to alledge the Judgment and Declarations of the Protestant Divines; for the *Pelagian Anabaptists* will not be perswaded by them; I shall therefore bring the plain Texts of the Holy Scripture, that affirm it. *St. Paul, Eph. 2. 3.* tells us, *That by nature we are children of wrath, even as others.* We can't be Children of Wrath, and Innocent; for God's Wrath is set only against the Guilty and Polluted Sons and Daughters of *Adam*. If therefore something were not found in us of Original Guilt and Defilement, derived to us from our Parents, we could not be liable to the Justice and Displeasure of our Sovereign Lord; and tho' Infants are not guilty of any Personal Offence; because they proceed from, and are concern'd with, a defiled Nature, they cannot be pure, and altogether free from the Uncleaness of that same from whence they issue. To this purpose are the Words of *Job, Chap. 14. ver. 4.* *Who can bring a clean thing out of an unclean? not one.* If therefore our Predecessors, from whom we are derived, are inclinable to Sin and Evil, as the Word of God often tells us, their Children cannot
but

but have something of that Original Pollution that is in them, and of that Primitive Guilt. Therefore Job speaks more plainly to the same purpose, Chap. 25. ver. 4, 5, 6. *How can a man be justified with God? or how can he be clean that is born of a woman? Behold even to the moon, and it shineth not, yea, the stars are not pure in his sight. How much less man, that is a worm, and the son of man, which is a worm? And David, Psal. 51. 5. declares in express Terms, Behold, I was shapen in Iniquity, and in Sin did my Mother conceive me. His very Make and Frame, and his Substance and Composition was infected with Iniquity and Sin from the Womb. Therefore St. Paul tells the Ephes. 2. 12. That before they were made nigh by the Blood of Christ, they were without Christ, aliens from the commonwealth of Israel, and strangers from the covenant of promise, having no hope, and without God in the World. This is the sad and woful State of such as are not admitted into the Covenant of Grace. They are in the State of defiled Nature, without Christ, out of his Visible Church and Society, and out of God's Favour, as far as we can judge, liable to Death, 1 Cor. 15. 22. *As in Adam all die, so in Christ shall all be made alive. If Death is inflicted upon Infants, 'tis a Sign of their Guilt; for Death was threatned as the Penalty of Sin. To this agrees St. Paul's Words, Gal. 3. 22. The scripture hath concluded**

cluded all under sin, Infants as well as others. If they were free from Sin, they would not suffer the Punishment threatned, which is Death; but as they cannot be charg'd with actual Transgressions, they are and must be subject to the Original: Therefore God declares, *That there is none righteous, no not one.* Shall we except our Children, when God does not? Again, *St. Paul saith, All have sinned, and come short of the glory of God.* If they have not actually sinned, they have sinned in their first Parents, being in their Loins in the same manner, as is said *Heb. 7. 9. Levi who receiveth tithes paid tithes in Abraham, for he was yet in the loins of his father, when Melchisedec met him.* According to the same sense we have sinned in Adam, because we were then in his Loins. The same Apostle often repeats this Doctrine, *Rom. 5. Wherefore as by one man sin enter'd into the world, and death by sin, and so death pass'd upon all men, for that all have sinned.* Again, *By the offence of one many are dead. By the offence of one death reigned. By the offence of one judgment came upon all men to condemnation. And by one man's disobedience many were made sinners, &c.* I judge these are such undeniable Texts, to prove Original Sin, that none but those who are wilfully blind must acknowledge, that we are by Nature polluted with it. Now the Enemies of this Doctrine are ready to object:

First, How can this agree with the Justice of God? That Children should suffer for the Sin of their first Parents, so long ago committed, and which they could not hinder?

I answer in the Language of St. Paul, They were in the Loins of the Founder of the Humane Race, and the Natural Covenant of Obedience was made with Adam in his Person, and as he represented all his Posterity: Therefore in him they all fell from their primitive Integrity, and from him they derive natural Guilt and Corruption with the substance of their Bodies, as from an infected Fountain, or Source. And why God has permitted our coming into the World in this manner, we are not to inquire; but we are inform'd in his Holy Word, That all are included under Sin, to Magnify the more his Mercy in our Redemption by Jesus Christ; his Infinite Wisdom in that wonderful Contrivance; and his Goodness and Power in advancing us through Death to the Seat of his Glory.

Secondly, Again they object, Do not the Bodies of Men proceed from God's Agency in the Womb? Seeing David tells us, *Psal. 119. 73. Thy Hands have made me and fashion'd me.* And *Psal. 139. 16. Thine Eyes did see my Substance, yet being unperfect, and in thy Book all my Members were written, which in continuance, were fashion'd, &c.* Therefore

can

can any thing proceed from God, but what is pure, undefiled and good, as to the Bodies of Men?

I answer, In the first Creation, Man proceeding immediately from God was perfect and holy; but afterwards, by disobedience and compliance with the Devil's Temptation, by forsaking his Maker and adhering to his Enemy, he hath disordered his natural Faculties, and is become defiled with Guilt and Corruption. Now all that proceeds from such a Polluted Original, cannot but bear away a savour and marks of its Primitive Source. And tho' God by his Providence, Blessing, and continuance of the Humane Race, hath an inspection and a hand in the Conception, Formation, and Generation of Mankind, from the first beginning he hath granted to the seminal matter a secret virtue of dilating it self into the several Members and parts of the Body, as he has given to all other Species, Animals, Plants, and Seeds to produce their several kinds, to multiply and increase by a command and ordination, *Gen. 1. 22, 28.* Therefore now we come into the World in the ordinary course and method, which God has appointed from the first Creation, and wherein he is not the only Agent, as he was then, but as we proceed from our sinful Parents; the Judgement of *Job* is indisputably true, *How can he be clean that is born of a Woman?* For that reason our Blessed Redeemer was to appear

appear in the World in an extraordinary manner : *A Virgin was to conceive and bear a Son* by the Power of the Holy Ghost, that was to overshadow her, that the Body and Humanity that was to be united to the Eternal Son of God, might be free from all manner of defilements and Original imperfection, *Luke 1. 35.* Therefore his coming into the World differ'd very much from ours, as to his external part. For when the Body in the Womb is duly Organiz'd, and become a fit Receptacle of that Spiritual Being, the Soul, 'tis generally believed, that then God breathes into it the Breath of Life, gives to it an Immortal Spirit, which proceeds not *ex traduce* as some vain and unconsiderate Persons have imagin'd; but from the immediate hand of the Father of Spirits, *Eccles. 12. 7.* And as the Soul or Spirit comes from God alone, we cannot think that to be any wise in the condition of the Body and Animal Part; but why the Creator of all things suffers an undefiled Soul to be joyned with a Polluted Companion, is a Question that deserves the Answer of St. Paul, *Rom. 9 20. Who art thou O Man! That repliest against God? Shall the thing formed, say to him that formed it, Why hast thou made me thus? Has not the Potter power over the Clay? &c.* The Secrets of God's proceedings in Nature and Providence, are not to be judg'd nor fathom'd by the Skill and short Reason of Man. 'Tis sufficient for us to know by Revelation; that we are born of and descended

scended from *Adam*, naturally Children of Wrath, liable to Temporal and Eternal Death, without the Mercy of God, and the Redemption of our Lord Jesus Christ, *Rom. 5. 17, 21.* And that Infants are to be partakers of this Redemption; for there is no other name or means of Salvation, but that of our Blessed Saviour, *Acts 4. 12.* Therefore they, as well as the Adult Persons, have a method offer'd to them to be partakers of our Lord's Redemption, and to be enter'd into his Church, as belonging to his Purchase and Peculium.

Thirdly, Now if we inquire what the Learned World in all Ages have said of this Original Sin, we shall find them agreeing with us, and judging both Children, as well as those of Riper years, under a necessity to come to the Laver of Regeneration, *i. e. Baptism*; that they might be absolved from this Original Guilt and Pollution, and admitted into a State of Grace and Mercy. A Learned Father saith in expresse Terms, *Nec parvuli de quibuslibet sanctis iustisq; procreati Originalis peccati absolvuntur, nisi in Christo fuerint Baptizati. l. 2. de Peccat. c. 12. Eph. 2. 9.* Infants born of never so Holy and Righteous Parents are not freed from the Guilt of Original Sin, unless they be Baptized into Christ. *Tertullian* speaks as plain to the same purpose, *Homo a primordio circumventus, si preceptum Dei excederet, & propterea in mortem datus, exinde totum genus de suo semine infectum*

Man having been from the beginning
 received, as he slighted the Commandment of
 God, he was Condemn'd to dye; from him
 his whole Race is infected by his Seed, *de*
Test. Anim. contra Gentes, and in his Treatise
Hab. Mul. He charges the unhappiness of
 Sin, with all the dismal Consequences, on our
 Grandmother *Eve*, as the first Original.
 likewise *Irenaus* tells us, c. 5. *Non aliter*
salvari Homines ab antiqua Serpentis Plaga, nisi
credant in eum qui secundum similitudinem
serpents peccati in ligno Martyrii exaltatur a terra:
 Men cannot otherwise be rescued from the
 mischief of the Ancient Serpent, unless they
 believe in him, who according to the simi-
 litude of the Sinful flesh, is lifted up from
 the Earth upon the Wood of his Cross. *A-*
gain, c. 21. Ut quem ad modum per Hominem
peccatum descendit in mortem Genus nostrum;
ita iterum per hominem Victorem ascendamus in
vitam. As our Human Race are fallen into
 Death by Man overcome; so we arise to
 life by man a Conqueror. These words of
Irenaus express the same truth as *St. Paul*,
Cor. 15. As in Adam all dye, so in Christ shall
all be made alive; for as Death is the Wages
 of Sin, none are Condemn'd to that Penalty
 of a just God, unless they be defiled with Sin.
 To the same purpose speaks *St. Chrysostome*
 of our first Parents, *They being by Sin become*
corruptible, they begat Children inclinable to the
same weakness; and they being born so qualified,
 they had their Lusts, their Fears and Pleasures to
 accompany

accompany them. The same Author takes notice, That *Adam* knew his Wife after he had Sinned, in the 50th *Psalms*, which we reckon the 51st. So that according to his Opinion none of *Adam's* Children were begot in State of Innocency, but after the Fall, and our Parents disobedience. By that means they became both Guilty and Corrupt: And the Fathers were of the same Judgment in Relation to Original Sin, but chiefly *Augustin*; who maintain'd this Divine Truth against the *Pelagian* Sect, who, tho' they denied Original Sin, yet they had not the Impudence to refuse Baptism to Infants; but judg'd it necessary, because of Christ's saying *Except a Person be born of Water and the Spirit he cannot enter into the Kingdom of God.* Amongst our Modern Divines, I find none questioning Original Guilt and Corruption with which we enter into the World. The Churches of *France*, in the first Confession of their Faith, believe, That all the Off-spring of *Adam* are infected with the Contagion of Original Sin, which is a Vice hereditary by Propagation, and not only by Imitation, as the *Pelagians* asserted, whose Errors are detested by us, Article 10. A. D. 1559. This Confession was composed and published at their first National Synod, Celebrated in the City of *Paris*, see *Quick's Synod. Vol. 1. p. 6.* To this Doctrine that Eminent and Orthodox Divine *Zanchius* agrees, *In peccato Originali, in quo omnes concipimur & nascimur, duo sunt Inobedientia Ad-*

tanquam

anquam capitis Noſtri, nobis tanquam ejus
 Membris juſtiſſime imputata, & Corruptio, &c.
 2. c. 5. de Anim. In Original Sin, in which
 we are all conceiv'd and born, there are Two
 things, the Diſobedience of Adam juſtly
 imputed from our Head to us, as to his Mem-
 bers, and Corruption, &c. And Mr. Calvin
 in his *Inſtit. Chriſt. Relig.* enforceth this
 Truth by a ſtrong Reason, *Nec mirum ſi Genus*
humani peſſundedit ſua Deſectione, qui totum Na-
turæ Ordinem pervertit in Cælo & in Terra, l. 2.
 c. 1. 5. 'Tis no wonder if Adam has Ruin'd
 his whole Race by his Apoſtacy, ſince he hath
 ſubverted the whole Order of Nature in
 Heaven and Earth. And a little after,
Quum ergo ſurſum & deorſum ex ejus Culpa fluxe-
rit maledictio, quæ graſſatur per omnes Mundi
Plagas, nihil a ratione alienum, ſi propagata fue-
rit ad totam ejus ſobolem. Therefore ſeeing
 from his Crime there is derived a Curſe to
 things above and below him, which has
 carried a Deſtruction to all parts of the
 World, 'tis not contrary to reaſon, that it
 ſhould be Conveyed to his Progeny. Like-
 wiſe *Bucan.* in his *Loc. Com.* 15. ſpeaks to the
 ſame purpoſe, *Peccatum Originale ab Adamo*
derivatur in Omnes decedentes, ne Infantibus
quidem exceptis in utero Matrum conceptis.
Nam licet Iniquitatis fructus non protulerint,
eorum tamen Natura eſt quoddam peccati ſemen
 & ideo Deo odioſa & abominabilis, *Rom.* 5. 14.
 Original Sin is derived from Adam upon all
 his Poſterity, the very Children conceived
 in

in the Womb of their Mothers not excepted; for tho' they have not produc'd any Fruits of Iniquity, their Nature is a Seed of Sin, and therefore odious and abominable to God. And *Wendelin* in his *Christian Theology* L. 1. c. 10. proves, That all Mankind proceeding from *Adam* and his Posterity in the natural order, are infected with Original Sin, the *Virgin Mary* not excepted; because the Holy Scripture, without any reserve charges all Persons descended from *Adam* with Sin, Christ excepted, *Rom.* 3. 10, 11, 12. *Rom.* 5. 12. *Gal.* 3. 22. because we are all subject to Misery and Death, which proceed from Sin; because we have need of Pardon and Forgiveness, and to be partakers of the Redemption of Christ, to return into the favour of our God. The same Doctrine was taught in the Confession of the *Bohemians*, which was that of the *Antient Albigenes* and *Vaudois*. *Est innatum & hereditarium Peccatum Originis, in quo omnes concipimur, & in hunc mundum nascimur*: Original Sin is born with us and hereditary: We are all conceived in it, and come into the World with it. Likewise in the Confession of *Wirtemberg* we meet with these words, *Idq; Malum, i. e. Peccatum non in uno tantum Adamo constituisse, sed propagati in omnem Posteritatem ejus*: That the evil of Sin consisted not only in *Adam*, but was propagated and spread to all his Posterity. We may by these Quotations, which I judge sufficient

at prove the Blessed Harmony of all Orthodox Churches of Christ agreeing together in this Doctrine with the Church of England ; That all Mankind since the fall of our first Parents, born of the mixture of the Seed of Men and Women, bring into the World with them *Original Sin*.

Of

Of Forms of Prayer in the Publick Worship of God ; And of the Liturgy of the Church of England.

THIS Sect, as most of our Dissenters have declar'd a particular Enmity against all Forms of Worship, and the Devotions of our Church, for they are contrary to its chief Design, which is Division; and because they are not agreeable with that disorderly Spirit that reigns amongst them, which gratifies every idle and empty Fancy, with the Liberty to vent what they please in speaking to God and Men. To prevent Irreverence, Nonsense, Confusion, and what is worse, Blasphemy in this Case, it has always been thought adviseable in all Regular Churches that profess Christianity, both Ancient and Modern, to have Publick Forms of Prayers and of Divine Worship, and not to leave the Disposition of a Service of that importance, to the Discretion of every Individual Person or Minister, because of the Weakness, Mistakes, and corrupt Intentions of Men. And there is no Nation or Church now extant in the World, but prescribes a Method and Form of Divine Service, to be used and practis'd in the Publick Congregations, from which Men living within the Jurisdiction, and of the same Communion, are not suffer'd to vary.

vary, but in ours and in *Holland*; so generally Forms of Prayer are approved of by all Christian Churches in the Publick Worship of God. But to give satisfaction in this Case to our Dissenters, I am now to prove,

First, That Forms of Prayer in the Publick Service of God, are of a Divine Appointment, and have ever been used by the Churches of God in all Ages.

Secondly, That they are the most convenient, most proper, most useful, and necessary for the due Performance of the Divine Service, and for the Benefit of the Petitioners.

Thirdly, That the Forms of Prayer enjoy'd in the Church of *England*, and our manner of offering them up to God, answer these Two Ends, the Glory of God, and the Edification of the serious, humble, and devout Assistants.

First, That Forms of Prayer in the Publick Service of God, are of a Divine Appointment, and have ever been used in the Churches of God in all Ages. In the *Jewish Church*, from its first Establishment we read, that *Moses* composed Psalms, of Thanksgiving, and Prayers, for his People to express their sense of God's Favours, Greatness, Eternity, and Goodness, and to acknowledge their own Unworthiness and Provocations: The 90th Psalm is of his composition for that purpose; and in *Exodus*, *Deuteronomy*, &c. we read of

Forms and Rules to be practised by the Israelites, at the eating of the Paschal Lamb and other Administrations. For the same purpose the *Psalms of David* were recommended to the People of God, to be used in his Publick Worship; therefore *2 Chron.* 29, 30. *Hezekiah the king and the princes commanded the Levites to sing praise unto the Lord, with the words of David and of Asaph the Seer, and they sung praises with gladness, and they bowed their heads and worshipped.* For that Intent those Psalms were adapted to the several Conditions of the Church of God, to be made use of in various Occasions. Likewise under the Gospel, we have that most excellent and comprehensive Form of Prayer of our Redeemer's composing, call'd the *Lord's Prayer*; and his Disciples are commanded by him to use it, *Luke II. 1, 2.* *One of his disciples said unto him, Lord teach us to pray, as John also taught his Disciples. And he said unto them, when ye pray say, Our Father, &c.* By this Text we may understand that *John*, the greatest of Prophets, had taught his Disciples Forms of Prayer, suitable to his Mission and Doctrine. For that reason one of Christ's Disciples solicited him to recommend unto them a Model of Prayer. To gratify this pious and reasonable Request our Saviour expressly commands them to use this Form of Prayer, *Our Father, &c.* *Matth. 6. 9.* *After this manner pray ye, Our Father, &c.* That is, let all your Prayers

compos'd and model'd after this Pattern :
First, To prefer the Glory of God before
 your private or publick Interests ; according
 to the same religious Usage *St. Paul* appoints
 and exhorts *Timothy*, 1 *Ep.* 2. 1. *That first*
of all supplications, prayers, intercessions, and
giving of thanks be made for all men, for kings,
and for all that are in Authority, &c. Here is a
 Model prescrib'd by the Apostle, and this
 belov'd Disciple was to word the Publick
 Prayers accordingly. Thus set Forms of
 Prayer are approved of by the Spirit of
 God in his Holy Word, and by the Practice
 of Christ and of his Holy Apostles. Thus
 from the Beginning, the Church of God have
 had Publick Prayers in use, compos'd by the
 religious Rulers. The Prayers of the *Greek*
and Eastern Congregations are yet extant in the
 Writings of the Fathers ; and the present
 Christian Churches in *France*, in the *Nether-*
lands, *Switzerland*, *Germany*, *Swedeland*, and
Denmark, have all their Forms for their
 Publick Devotions. So Universal a Practice
 of God's People in most Nations of Orthodox
 Principles, should prevail upon our Dissenters
 not to despise or neglect so necessary and
 precious a Custom, derived to us from Christ
 and his Holy Apostles. For our *Anabaptists*
 have not only rejected all Publick Forms,
 but have condemn'd, and many of them cast
 Dirt, and abuse, by blasphemous Expressions,
 the *Lord's Prayer*. Now how can these Men
 have the Impudence to boast, that they

exactly follow the Rules of Holy Scripture in all things, while they are so directly contrary to it in this Case? And as Forms are regular Directions for Prayer, can they entertain the Thought, that their irregular and unwarrantable Performances are more acceptable to God, than Prayers approved and Divine Forms? for, I suppose, that they oppose to Forms only their Prayers *extempore* otherwise, if they are compos'd by themselves and fix'd in their Memories, they are then Forms of their own Invention. In such a Case they condemn their own Practices, by exclaiming against all Forms. But which may be judg'd most valuable by Men of Reason those that are recommended to us by the wise Governors of the Nation, by Men of Piety and Learning; or those Forms that are regulated by, and proceed from a Private Spirit, perhaps of a Blue, White, Green, or Leathern Apron *Apostle* or *Bishop* of the *Anabaptists*? For unless these Mechanical Teachers pretend to Inspiration and Enthusiasm, there is no other way to offer our Prayers, but by the Assistance of Forms either imprinted in our Memories, or before us in a Book, or *extempore*, which supposes either the Matter or the Words to break suddenly out of our Imagination, with or without a Premeditation. If with, such Prayers are near related to those we offer to God with Forms; for the Matter of the Expressions, or perhaps both, are
 forme

formed in our Minds, before we vent them, and utter them with our Tongues. Now 'tis my purpose to shew in the next Place,

Secondly, That Forms of Prayer are the most convenient and proper, most useful and necessary, for the due Performance of the Divine Service, and for the benefit of the Assistants. 'Tis indeed very strange, that our *Anabaptists*, and particularly *Joseph Hooke*, that wise *Apostle*, should glory in their weakness and shame; That they have neither *Common Prayer*, *Rubrick*, nor *Directory*, nor any *Forms*, as if all Rules and Directions to assist our Devotions, were contrary to the Will of God, and his Holy Word. But tho' these Men have declared their Aversion against Rules in this Case, as they are agreeable with Scripture Examples and Precepts, they are the most convenient and proper, most useful and necessary for the due Performance of the Divine Service. The Honour to be render'd to the Majesty of our Creator and Redeemer, requires that Men should appear before him not abruptly, but with a serious Preparation, and with a ready and well compos'd Mind and Petitions, of which we on a sudden are not capable. For that reason *Solomon* advises, *Keep thy Foot when thou goest to the house of God, and be more ready to hear than to give the sacrifice of fools. Be not rash with thy mouth, and let not thy heart be hasty to utter any thing before God, for God is in heaven, and thou upon the earth; therefore*

let thy words be few. Are we not to have as much Regard for our God, as we commonly have for Princes and Great Men? Don't we study to speak advisedly in their Presence? And does less respect become our Almighty God? What assurance have we, that all our sudden and hasty Expressions shall be answerable to the Duty, Reverence, and Submission, that we owe to so good and glorious a Being, and that nothing shall escape us, that may favour of Weakness or Sin? If Men understood the Difficulty of performing this part of Religion as they ought, they would not quarrel at the Helps offer'd to us, to present our Petitions with more Zeal and Affection. Who knows but that some unexpected Accident may disorder our Prayers, disturb our Minds, and cause Tautologes, Nonsense, and unlawful Expressions to drop from our Mouths. Tho' some may be gifted with a voluble Tongue, quick Apprehension, and other Abilities requisite in all *extempore* long Prayers, What shall others do, not so well gifted? They must needs come short in what is wanted in this most necessary and spiritual Duty: Therefore not only in respect to God and his Glory, but in Reference to the Wants and Weaknesses of Men, our set Forms are proper and necessary. For in all publick Devotions, there is a regard to be had of the Infirmities of the weakest sort of Men, who tho' they may not be concern'd in speaking from the People to God, yet as
Hearers

Hearers they can better understand, offer up, and present their Requests, when they are acquainted with the Matter and Expressions, and know before hand that they are answerable to their Necessities, and agreeable with the Will of God, which they cannot so quickly apprehend, when they know not what the Minister will say, whether it be just and a fit Petition to make to God; there must be some time allowed, tho' but a Minute, or a Moment, to make such an Examination and Reflection; before he can perform it, the speaker proceeds on to other Requests. So that without set Forms, with which we are acquainted, I see no likelihood of the Hearers keeping pace with the Minister, and joyning in Attention and Affection with him in every Supplication. And for the Minister himself, if he hath never so quick and admirable Abilities for a long *extempore* Prayer, and be never so much accustomed to utter himself to God in this manner, he has but one Soul, and one Thought at the same Instant, one Imagination, that is to find out the Matter, Words, and Expressions. While 'tis thus employ'd and occupied to find fit Expressions to God, according to the Subject, how can he at the same instant of Time move the Affections of his Mind, which are necessarily requir'd, and must speak unto God, or else the Devotion is very lame and insignificant. We may hear from the Mouth, an eloquent Harangue, pathetick Expressions,

a fine Discourse, but if the Affections of the Heart be wanting, the Sacrifice is dead. The Whisperings of a devout Heart, are more acceptable to God than the Loud Orations of the most eloquent Tongues. Now when the Minister knows before, what he is to say, and the People likewise, they are beforehand prepared to present their Petitions to the Throne of Grace with that Holy Zeal and Devotion as becomes them, which they have time and leasure to devise in their Minds. 'Tis therefore our Saviour's saying, *That as God is a spirit, they that will worship truly, must worship in spirit and in truth*, John 4. 23, 24. The meaning of Christ is, that our Prayers and Devotions must have something above a Carnal and Formal Performance, they must be sent up to God, not only from the Attention and Intention of the Soul, that spiritual Being, but also from the fervent Affections of the Heart. Such a Method is the most convenient and proper for this purpose, that may render us able to offer up our Petitions in that holy and acceptable manner. Again, Our Prayers may be said to be a Worship in Spirit, when we know they are suitable to the Dictates of the Spirit of God, answerable to Divine Revelation. This spiritual Service we may best understand from and in prescribed Forms, sooner than from a Prayer that we never heard before.

I must confess 'tis the most difficult Duty that belongs to a Christian's Life ; therefore

we should seek for all the Assistance, as of Nature, Grace, and Art, to render to our God in Prayer all the Homage that his Sovereignty claims, and his daily Benefits and our Obligations require from us. For 'tis represented by Divines, *to be the earnest affection of the heart lifted up to God, by which we Petition and expect from him alone, for Christ's sake, spiritual and corporal Blessings, according to his Order and Promises, and by which we return him Thanks for his former Favours.* Now this Elevation of the Heart and Mind, is not an easy Performance to Flesh and Blood, particularly when Men are immers'd in sensual Delights, and clog'd with worldly Concerns and Disturbances.

Thirdly, *The Forms of Prayer enjoyn'd in the Church of England, and our manner of offering them up to God, answer these Two Ends, the Glory of God, and the Edification of the serious, humble, and devout Assistants.* This will more plainly appear, if we consider the matter, or substance, and manner of presenting our Petitions. First, The matter and substance tends to the Glory of God, to glorify his Goodness, Mercy, Power, All-sufficiency, and Infinite Perfections, which the Petitioners publicly acknowledge. There is no Clause nor Expression in all the Offices that can be interpreted to any other purpose; and our seeking from him all things needful for our Souls and Bodies, is an open Declaration of our owning him to be our Rich and

O 5 Bountiful.

Bountiful Benefactor. *Secondly*, The manner inward and outward, tends directly to this Blessed End : The inward, for while we hear the Words pronounced, which we know to be agreeable to the Will of God, we are to stir up our Affections zealously to offer up the Petitions to our good God, and to accompany the Minister's Words with our hearty Desires. And as there is a Part that the People are to be concern'd in the Offices, this is to summon their Attention, and encourage their Devotion. The outward manner of presenting our Requests, tends to the Glory of God ; for we have that profound Respect for our Almighty Creator, that we dare not come before him, to offer to him the hasty and inconsiderate Requests of our Lips, or of others. But as these Petitions have been duly examin'd, and approved of by the Wisdom of the Rulers of our Church and Nation, and by our selves ; we know them to be agreeable to God's Will, and therefore are certain that they will be acceptable to him, when we offer them up with the Humility of the Body, and the Devotion of the Mind, according to the prescribed Rules.

Likewise in all these several Respects, they tend to the Edification of the serious, humble, and devout Christian ; To instruct and confirm him in the Orthodox Principles of true Religion ; To ~~advise~~ ^{advance} him in his Duty and Homage to his good God ; To encourage
his

his Faith, Hope, and Assurance in his Mercy ; To keep him in a Disposition of Humility, and a proper Object of Divine Goodness ; and in a Word, To prepare his Soul for a Blessed Eternity. Is there any Request in all our Publick Prayers, that the Dissenters would not be glad to receive and obtain from God ? All the Necessities of Mankind are there consider'd, and a Supply is humbly requested of God to their several Wants. The vain Repetitions objected, is an idle and insignificant Exception ; and that our Prayers are taken out of the Mass-Book, is another Fanatick Fancy ? Is there any thing there, that favours of the Popish Superstitions and Errors ? 'Tis very strange, that the Pope and his Agents should declare such an unreconcilable Aversion against them, if they were agreeable with their Perswasions. These Prayers at the beginning of our Reformation (which for the Honour of it was carried on and compleated without popular Tumults and Rebellion) were compos'd by the Bishops and Learned and Orthodox Divines of the Nation, and purg'd from all Dregs of Popery and Idolatry ; for as our Wise Saviour, when he establish'd the Christian Church, took from the *Jews* divers Rites and Practices, and stamp'd them with his Divine Authority, as the Matter of both Sacraments of a *Jewish* Original : So our first Reformers thought not convenient totally to abolish all the former Prayers, but to remove from them the Dross and

and Corruption, and to keep a great part of the Substance and Method in our Devotions. In this proceeding they had the Example of our Blessed Master, to warrant their Prudence; they thought it not Justice nor Wisdom to the dislike of the Innocent and Orthodox Usages of the Popish Church; to destroy the whole Body that was found, because of some rotten parts, and to declare an Enmity against them all, meerly because they were practised by them; many of these Usages having been in the Churches of God, before they became Popish, and we find them both in the *Eastern* and *Western* Congregations. For these and other Reasons, I intreat our Dissenters, who are so averse to our Publick Prayers, seriously to weigh without prejudice in an equal Balance, all the Exceptions that are commonly made against them, with what we have to say for our selves, and they shall find them very light and unreasonable. They shall find Pride and Fancy, Education and Custom, Interest and Engagements, Partiality and Mistakes, the principal Causes of their Displeasure and Distaste at our Devotions, which the Wisdom of the Nation prefers to a Presbyterian *Directory*, or the irregular and *extempore* Tones and Cants of Enthusiastick *Anabaptists*. They are possessed with such a Hatred against them, that they refuse to be present when we pray, and will admit no manner of Religious Communion with us, as if we were *Turks* and *Infidels*. Their
Teachers

Teachers incourage in all their Disciples an Aversion to our Church, and the Principles of Division, which are entertain'd by their simple and unadvised Profelytes ; for this Perswasion is proper to humor only the ignorant and disaffected Vulgar. I shall therefore next inquire into

The Sinfulness of Schism and Separation from the Church of England.

UNION and Unity in Religion, amongst all Christ's Disciples, is one of the principal Designs of our Redemption, and the purpose of our Redeemer, *John* 17. 21. Therefore St. *Paul* endeavours to perswade the Churches where he had preach'd the Gospel, to be of one Judgment, of one Mind, of one Perswasion, and of one Faith and Religion ; and to the *Ephesians* he presses this Unity by divers weighty Considerations, because there is but one Body, one Spirit, one Hope of our Calling, one Lord, one Faith, one Baptism, one God and Father of all. Schism is a Breach of this Unity, a Disorder in the Church of Christ, a thwarting of his chief purpose in our Redemption, which is to unite us all together in one Mystical Body his Catholick Church, and bring us at last to one blessed Kingdom of Heaven, where he is to Reign over us for ever. Now they who have a real Interest in this Merciful

ful Saviour, and expect to be Partakers of and Subjects in that glorious Kingdom, should methinks joyn together now on Earth. None can be ignorant that this Union tends to the Honour of our Saviour, the Glory of Christianity, the Salvation of Souls, the Conversion of Infidels, and the publick Interest of us all, who have any Pretensions to Heaven, and the future State of Immortality. From these Considerations the Guilt of Schism may appear without disguise to be hainous, and is not so easily excused before God by the childish and vain Pretences of designing Men. Union amongst Christians is of that Consequence to the Interest of Christ and Christianity, that every frivolous Distaste or groundless Objection, is not sufficient to warrant a Breach of Unity, and cause a Separation; for unless we have plain Texts of the Word of God to justify it, 'tis a known Sin, which Men commit upon a bare suspicion of a deluded Conscience. That it is a Sin may be proved, First, by God's express Command to all Christ's Disciples, to *Endeavour the unity of the spirit in the bond of Peace*, Eph. 4. *That they may with one mind, and one mouth, glorify God, even the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ*, Rom. 15. 6. *That they all may be of one mind, and may live in peace*, 2 Cor. 13. 11. *That they may stand fast in one spirit, with one mind, striving together for the faith of the Gospel*, Phil. 1. 27. And 'tis the Exhortation of St. Paul, Rom. 16. 17.

I beseech you brethren, mark them which cause divisions and offences, contrary to the doctrine which ye have learned, and avoid them. For they that are such, serve not our Lord Jesus Christ, but their own belly, and by good words, and fair speeches, deceive the hearts of the simple: Likewise to the Corinthians he saith, 1 Cor. 1. 10. Now I beseech you brethren, by the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, that ye all speak the same thing, and that there be no divisions among you, but that ye be perfectly joined together in the same mind, and in the same Judgment. And he declares it to be a Mark of their Carnality, and of their being Enemies of the Cross of Christ. By these and such like Texts, we may understand, that Division is contrary to the Mind of God and Christ, and that where 'tis possible to be united with the Professors of Christianity, without contracting the Guilt of Sin, 'tis our Duty to joyn with them. Now there is nothing in our Communion, that can draw this Guilt upon such as partake with us; for there are but Two Cases which may oblige a Separation from a Church; the one when we are required to acknowledge such Doctrines that we know by God's Word to be erroneous; another, when we are to comply with such Practices, as are contrary to the Laws of God. A bare Fancy, an empty suspicion, or a deceived Conscience, which our Adversaries commonly pretend for their Breach of Unity, are no sufficient Grounds to violate

late the Commands of God in this Case. The Actors in the Gun-powder Treason and the Popish Traytors, had the same Plea of Conscience, to justify and excuse their Conspiracies; and there is no Unjustice but may cover it self with this Cloak. Now the Scare-crows that fright these weak Souls out of our Communion, are the use of the Surplice, our Forms and Manner of Publick Prayers, the Ring in Marriage, the Sign of the Cross in Baptism, the Admission of Infants to that Ordinance, our Mode of Sprinkling, &c. Unless it be the Two last, which we have proved necessary, and of a Divine Institution, the others are in themselves indifferent. Now to comply with indifferent Matters can be no Sin; therefore to separate from us only for that reason, is inexcusable. And tho' some may pretend the Imposition of them by lawful and humane Authority, which to us the Members of the Church of *England* removes all Indifferency, but to others causeth them to be look'd upon as sinful, because they fanſie them to be Additions to the Word of God, as they weakly pretend; and whatsoever Christ or his Apostles spoke in their Time against the Traditions of Men, and of the Ancient *Pharisees*, and of the Rudiments of the World, these prejudiced People often cite those Texts against our Religious Forms and Rites. Whereas we have as often declared them to be humane Injunctions, design'd by the Wisdom of our Rulers

Rulers for a more orderly and decent Performance of the Divine Service, and that they were never intended of themselves to be equally valued with the Divine Laws or Articles of Faith. But since they have been appointed by our Superiors, to observe an Uniformity all over the Nation, in the Worship of God and other Religious Usages, every humble Christian thinks he owes that deference and esteem for the Prudence and Discretion of our Kings and Parliaments, as not to vary from their Prescriptions; and we judge that in this Case we have divers Texts of the Word of God, to command and warrant our Obedience, as *Titus 3. 1. Put them in mind to be subject to principalities and powers, to obey Magistrates. Heb. 13. 17. Obey them that have the rule over you, and submit your selves, for they watch for your souls, &c. 1 Pet. 2. 13: Submit yours selves to every ordinance of Man, for the Lord's sake, &c.* These and such like Texts require our active as well as passive Obedience, to all such Orders as are not contrary to the declared and plain Word of God: Therefore our *Anabaptists* are guilty of a Sin against God, by their separation from us. And the publick Indulgence and Toleration granted to them lessens not, but rather aggravates their Guilt; because tho' the Government hath suspended the Execution of all Penal Laws in favour of their perswasion, they are continually reflecting in Print upon the Rulers Ecclesiastical and Civil, and

and have adjudg'd their Baptism and Christianity a Nullity. Christ in condemning the Traditions of Men, was so far from discrediting their Lawful Orders, that he hath requir'd our Obedience to them; the Traditions that he blames, were only those that render'd the Laws of God of none Effect, and disannull'd the Divine Commands. Ours, against which our Dissenters quarrel, are not of that kind, but perfectly agree with the revealed Word of God.

Secondly, Separation from our Church, and the Schism of the *Anabaptists*, is a Sin against the Examples of Christ and his Apostles, which we are commanded to follow. 1 Pet. 2. 21. and Phil. 3. 19. *Brethren, be followers together of me, and mark them which walk so as ye have us for an ensample.* Now what is the Example, that Christ hath set before us in our Case? He was, while he was upon Earth, belonging to the Jewish Church, and tho' he reprov'd many Irregularities and Corruptions, that had crept into it, yet neither he nor his Apostles would forsake their Communion, nor forbear the Practice of some things, that were of humane appointment and indifferent: Again, it was his express Order, that as the *Scribes* and *Pharisees* were sitting in *Moses Seat*, tho' they were his Enemies, and both erroneous and vicious, yet he commands his Disciples, *All therefore whatsoever they bid you observe, that observe and do*, &c. Matth. 23. 2. He was Circumcised the

the Eighth day ; He was Baptized by *John* with *Publicans* and *Sinners*, and reckon'd that Act as part of that Righteousness that he was bound to fulfil ; he frequented their Synagogues and Temple ; he observ'd their Festivals and Paschal Lamb. And after his Resurrection, for fear of giving offence, the Apostles kept external Communion with the *Jews*, and oblig'd *St. Paul* to purify himself in the Temple, *Acts* 21. The Schism and Separation of the *Anabaptists*, is directly contrary to these Examples of our Blessed Master and his Apostles ; for tho' they have not so much reason as they had, to divide from the *Jewish* Synagogue, they add to the Crime of Separation the most scandalous and basest Abuse ; they compare us to those Idolaters or Worshipers of the false Gods, mentioned *2 Cor.* 6. 16. which Command of God they commonly quote, to justify their Separation from us. Thereby let the World judge of their favourable Opinion of us and our Religion.

Thirdly, Their Separation is extreamly sinful, because of the many evil Consequences that attend it ; and because of the mischievous Sequels. Their Profelytes are thereby continu'd in their Mistakes and Errors, and are kept by them from the Grace of Repentance. Their Children that dye in their Minority, are excluded out of the Covenant of Christ, and their Salvation is very doubtful, having no visible Right to the Redemption

tion of Christ. By this Division the evil Spirits of Hatred, Malice, Envy, Contention and Revenge, are entertain'd in their Breasts and Charity, that Blessed Grace of the Spirit of God, is stifled and extinguish'd in their Hearts. I could reckon many other Mischiefs that this Sect draw upon themselves and others, by their groundless Separation which very much aggravate their Sin before God.

Now the Causes and Reasons they commonly bring to excuse their dividing from us are so weak, so frivolous, false, childish, and ridiculous, that they deserve not to be mention'd. A Specimen of them we find in a small Pamphlet of one *Robert Cobb of Graveend*, an Apostate from the Church of England for these Reasons, as he says: Because the Subjects of our Baptism come not as Christ came to *John*, but are brought, and because they go not into the Water, but the Water is brought to them: Because we make all the World, and Infants, Church Members: Because we do not dip in Baptism, as he supposes *John* did; which I have proved to be false: Because Children cannot perform what is required in Scripture from the Adult before Baptism: Because we celebrate the Lord's Supper not at Night, nor sitting at the Communion, but kneeling: Because in our Litany we swear Eight times, when we beseech Almighty God, *By the Mystery of thy Holy Incarnation, by thy Holy Nativity and*

Circumcision, by thy Baptism, &c. Because we have Ceremonies not commanded by Christ, amongst which he reckons Surplice, cutting of Bread, Organs, Musick, Impertinent Holy-days, Altars, Rails, &c. Because God commanded his People to come out of *Babylon*, Rev. 18. 4. And such like non-sensical Grounds of Separation, that declare him, and a great many of his Fraternity, to be out of their Wits, or to be possessed with an evil Spirit of Error and Contradiction. The many Mis-interpretations, and Mis-applications of Holy Scripture, the Mistakes and Falsties that this Man is guilty of in his Book, I think not worth mentioning; they are apparent to the Reader that understands sense. We partly owe this Separation from our Church, to the subtil Endeavours of the Popish Priests and Jesuits amongst our Dissenters, and partly to the Pride, Haughtiness, Conceitedness of Men, and the late Anarchy. King *Charles* at his first Restauration advised with his Council, how to bring in the soberer Party of the disaffected People: For that purpose he appointed divers of his restored *Bishops*, to meet the *Presbyterian* Divines, and consult about some means of an Union; Dr. *Morley*, afterwards Bishop of *Winchester*, was one, from whose Mouth I had this Relation. When our *Common-Prayer* was in question, and divers Exceptions were made against some Clauses, it was then offer'd to the
Adverse

Adverse Party, to compose other Public Prayers, and if they were better, and no Objections to be made against them, that they should be accepted. But the principal Causes of the Continuance of the Division were the *Solemn League and Covenant* unto which many of them had been sworn and tho' it was an unlawful Oath and Engagement, contrary to the Rights of the Subjects of *England*, and to the known Laws as our Parliaments have declared, they who had been drawn into it, could not so speedily yield to a Renunciation. Another Cause they were requir'd to be re-ordain'd by the Bishops, and an Act pass'd for that purpose. This they look'd upon as a Renunciation of their first Ordination, and a publick Declaration of their former Ministry to be null, which would have given a great offence to their Auditors and People, and represented them to the World as meer Cheats and Impostors in Religion, if they all had complied, as some did, to keep their Benefices. If at that Juncture Men of both Sides had not been so imperious, stiff, revengeful, and untractable, if they had all sincerely minded the Glory of God, and the Publick Union, some means might probably then have been contrived to put a Period to all our Separations and Dissensions in Religion, which now are like to continue to the World's End, to the great discredit of our understand-

ing

ing Nation, and dishonour of our Reformation, as well as to the Prejudice of Souls, and our Saviour's interest in the World.

Of Apostacy, and the Danger of this Sin.

A Postacy is a Word of Greek Original, signifying a forsaking and falling away from any Party to another, and is commonly more strictly understood by the sacred Writers, in Cases of Religion, for a Desertion of God and his Church; a Desertion of the Truth, to embrace a real or supposed Error, and joyn with that Number of Men, who make profession of it; so St. *Luke* understands it, *Acts* 21. 21. where the Elders of *Jerusalem* tell *Paul*, That they had been inform'd of him, ὅτι ἀποστασίαν διδάσκεις ἀπὸ Μωϋσέως, That thou teachest all the Jews which are among the Gentiles to forsake *Moses*. This forsaking of *Moses* is named by the Evangelist *An Apostacy from Moses*; because those Jews having been enter'd into the Legal Covenant, whereof *Moses* had been the Mediator, they were engaged to observe all the *Levitical Rites*. Now the leaving of the Practice of that Religion recommended by *Moses*, is stiled an *Apostacy*, and the Word ἀποστάτης, the guilty Person is interpreted by *Budens*, a Desertor of that Religion

ligion that he professed, a spiritual Revolt from God. In that sense we find the Verb to apostatize, *Heb. 3. 12. Take heed brethren lest there be in any of you an evil heart of unbelief, ἐν τῷ ἀποστῆναι ἀπὸ θεοῦ ζῶντος, in departing from the living God.* So *2 Chron. 29. 6* and *1 Tim. 4. 1. In the latter days, ἀποστήσονται τινὲς τῆς πίστεως, some shall depart from the Faith.* Likewise *2 Thess. 2. 3.* The Defection of the Church of Rome from the Christian Faith, is expressly nam'd ἀποστασίαν, an Apostacy. According to the sense of the Spirit of God in these Texts, Apostacy is a Sin more heinous than a bare Separation or Schism, a Crime of a deeper dye, that supposes First that the Person guilty has been a Member and a Professor of the Truth, that he abandons; for Men may be born in a Schismatical Church, and may formerly have been Separatists, they can never be said to be Apostates, because they were always of the same divided Congregation. But as the Word implies a Revolt, they only can be charg'd with the Crime, who forsake their first Faith and Profession in which they were engaged.

Secondly, 'Tis a Revolt, or falling away to a contrary Party, whose Principles are opposite to the former that they embraced, and to such a Party that has renounc'd all religious Communion with our Church, and its Professors. Thus the Church of Rome is accus'd by the Apostle, to have deserted

the

the Purity of the Gospel of Christ, to fall away to damnable Delusions, 2 *Thess.* 2.

Thirdly, 'Tis such a Revolt, as to break of all Religious Communion with the former Church, and to be joyn'd with that Revolted Party, that is at an open Enmity and Defiance with our Church. Therefore it implies not a secret running away, but an avowed Rebellion against the Church of God. and an open War that we declare against it and its Professors and Principles.

Now divers of the *Anabaptists*, such who have been baptized in our Communion, and admitted by that Sacrament to its outward Privileges, and who have since been perverted by the *Anabaptists*, and dipped into their Sect; such who abjure us, and our Holy Profession, and account of our Church no better than Congregations of Heathens and Infidels, as they have publicly proclaim'd in Print, I say such Persons are, without mincing the matter, Apostates from our Christian Church, and by consequence from the Catholick Church, whereof 'tis an illustrious Branch. They have excommunicated themselves from this Mystical Body, and draw after them their unhappy Posterity into this deluded Party, into the Devil's Snares. 'Tis not sufficient, to pretend that they fall from us as a Corrupted Body; they ought to evidence this Corruption by undeniable Proofs, and plain Texts out of the Word of God, which they cannot do. And

we appeal to all the present Churches of Christ in the World, and desire them to be our Judges, that if all those Exceptions were really true, which I dare assert that they are not, but as I said before, they are childish, frivolous, false, &c: They are not scriptural Warrants to break off Communion with us.

But some of this Sect proceed to the highest degree of Apostacy, that is, the Blasphemy against the Holy Ghost, which can prove many, not only of the *Socinian*, *Antinomian*, and *Fifth-Monarchy Anabaptists* to have committed, but of the regular sort. The hot and fiery Spirits do often blaspheme our Ministry, our Prayers, Devotions and whole Religion, and make it their business to discredit us, accusing us to be Hirelings, and our Baptism, Christ's Ordinance, a Nullity and all our, and the Bishop's Performances, insignificant. What other Blasphemies have dropt from their Pens and Tongues, in relation to our Religion, I dread to publish, they are so odious: Therefore in reference to them we will speak the Words of Christ *Wherefore I say unto you, all manner of sin and blasphemy shall be forgiven unto men, but the blasphemy against the holy Ghost shall not be forgiven unto men.* For besides their wilfull Apostacy, their embracing their pernicious Principles, their stiff adhering to this erroneous Party, we may perceive a deadly Hatred against us and our Church

which

which causes them to vilify us, and render us odious to their Profelytes. This sad and averse Disposition makes their Repentance more difficult, so that seldom we see any of them recant and repent of their Apostacy.

If any question the Truth of this Charge of Blasphemy, they may find it in Print, in the Sermon of one *Robins*, at the Funeral of Mr. *Gammon*, where he saith that *Faith, Repentance, and sincere Obedience, is a Device of Satan, and an Idol of a Threefold Composition*. And in some other of the *Anabaptists Books*, we can find these Damnable Positions, *That God forceth Men to sin; That it is his Will; That he sees no sin in his Eleſt; That no Wickedneſs can ſeparate them from God; That at the Moment they commit Murder, or any Villany, they are as acceptable to him, as when they are in the pureſt State of Life; That there is a certain part of Mankind condemn'd to be Damn'd; That they alone are the Favorites of Heaven, and that they have no need to pray for the Pardon of their Sins*. They tell us, *St. James was not Orthodox, when he joyns Faith and Works together*.

I appeal alſo to the Diſputes between *Matthew Caſſin* and *Thomas Monk*, and the Reflections of *Dr. Ruſſel* upon the *Gofwel-Street Meeters*, and the Pamphlet of *Joſeph Taylor*, to prove by their own Con-

fessions, that some of their *Anabaptists* are
grievous *Hereticks*, *Blasphemers* of God and
Christ, and that they are betwix'd by the
Devil, as any may read in a Book publish'd
by *Thomas Monk* against *Cassin* and his
Profelytes.

The

Th
a S
ing
tia
Sec
nor
Ye
Ti
tick
wh
the
Bu
Ag
pre
faic
of
Pro
Ph
and
sim
Co
of
wa
and
wa

*The History of the Anabaptists, from
their first appearance in the World till
this Time, in Foreign Parts and in
England.*

TIS certain that this Sect of the *Anabaptists*, as we understand them, *i. e.* a Sect denying Baptism to Infants, pleading for the Mode of Dipping, as an essential part of that Ordinance, &c. is a New Sect, never known to the Primitive Church, nor to the following Ages till about the Year 1521, or 1522. Some before that Time might be for Re-baptizing of *Heretics* returning to the Church, or *Apostates*, who fell in Times of Persecution; and others might cry down Baptism as useless: But I find no Record or History of former Ages, that mention this Sect, as 'tis now professed by them, before the Year aforesaid: When one *Nicholas Storke* first began of his own Head, without any Vocation, to Preach in *Germany*, and to gather Disciples. *Phil. Melancthon* makes mention of him, and tells us by what Arts he deluded the simple People: He pretended that he had Communication with God, by the intercourse of an Angel, and by Dreams; That he was promised the Place of the Angel *Gabriel*, and the Empire of the World; That he was appointed to be their Leader; That

his Saints should share amongst them the Kingdoms and Provinces, the Glory and Riches of the Earth; and, That he was commanded to destroy the Monarchs, Princes, and Nobles, and to reform the Church. Such wild and rebellious Insinuations and Notions being encourag'd by a supposed Divine Revelation, were greedily entertain'd by the necessitous Tradesmen, Artificers, and Labourers of the Country, who flock'd from all Parts to hear this New Prophet, that Preach'd many pernicious Doctrines, and amongst the rest, That Children were not to be Baptized. *Thomas Muncer* and *Phifer*, were Two of his principal Disciples, who proceeding after the Steps of their Master, took upon them the Ministry. *Muncer* set up for himself at *Alsted* in *Thuringia*, Anno Domini 1525. as *Lambertus Hortensius* witnesseth. At his first arrival he associated with the Tradesmen, and infected the meaner sort of People with his erroneous Principles, and with a dislike of the Doctrine of *Luther*, and of the Reformation. In imitation of his Tutor, he entertain'd his Hearers with his idle Dreams and Revelations from above, Preaching against a Propriety of Goods, Christ's assuming his Flesh from the Virgin *Mary*, his Divine Nature, the Satisfaction of the Cross, the Baptism of Infants, the impossibility of Salvation out of their Sect, &c. While he medled not with

the

the Princes and Magistrates, and their Authority and Dominion, the Duke of *Saxony* suffer'd him to keep his Conventicle: But when the number of his Followers began to increase, *Muncer* administred an Oath to them, to assist him in killing the ungodly Princes and Magistrates. There was then a general Complaint of the grievous Taxes and Oppressions that were laid upon the common People, by the Princes and Lords of the Country. *Muncer* and his Followers took an Advantage of it, to insinuate his rebellious Doctrines amongst the Malecontents, promising them a Redress of all their Grievances, and the Goods and Possessions of the Nobles and Gentry, to make them amends for their former Sufferings, if they would afford him their Assistance, and embrace his Religion. The same Policy *Mahomet* had practised before him amongst his *Arabians* and *Saracens*, in the days of the Emperor *Heraclius*. When the Duke of *Saxony* understood the Boldness and Designs of this New Prophet, and his success, he banish'd him out of his Dominions: From whence he went to *Nurenberg*, a large and populous City of *Germany*; but the Magistrates there being inform'd of his Wicked Purposes, drove him out of the Town. We hear of him next at *Mulhus*, another Imperial City of that Country, where he Preach'd to a Congregation, and divers of his former Acquaintance resorted

to him; there being encouraged by the Number of his Disciples, who esteem'd him as a Divine Oracle, he taught boldly, That all Goods and Estates were to be common; That Distinctions of Noble Men and Vassals ought no longer to be suffer'd; That they ought to be all free and equal; That it was not lawful for the Saints to obey the Civil Magistrate; but that they must establish a Kingdom amongst themselves, where Christ might begin his Reign on Earth. These and such other Doctrines being spread amongst the Peasants of *Suevia* and *Frankonia*, many of them forsook their Husbandry and Trades, and to the number of 40000 took up Arms; *Muncer* and *Phifer* headed them. Their Beginnings were so successful, that being conducted by *Phifer*, they plunder'd several wealthy Towns, burnt the Houses, took Prisoners divers of the Nobility, brought into their Camp a great number of Cattle. This encouraged the neighbouring Country of *Mansfelt*, to joyn with these Fanatick Rebels, who march'd to, and took possession of *Frankbus*, a Town of *Germany*, where upon a Hill they encamp'd, when Count *Mansfield* with his Army overtook them. At the first Encounter the disciplin'd Soldiers had the Advantage of them, forced them to Retreat, and kill'd about Two Hundred; the rest barricadoed themselves with Waggon and Carts, with a Resolution to stand upon their defence

defence against the Count's Army, and the Princes his Assistants. But out of Compassion of the deluded People, they sent them a general Pardon, if they would deliver up *Muncer* and their chief Leaders; which they rejected, trusting upon the Dreams of their Preachers, and Assurances from them of God's Assistance, who had sent *Muncer* to be their Leader, and promised to him a notable Victory, and that his Righteous Followers should *wash their Feet in the Blood of the ungodly* that opposed them; so that when the Princes thunder'd against them with their Canon, they sung the Hymn, *Come Holy Ghost*; and expected that God would thunder upon their Enemies, and put them to flight, according to the vain perswasion of their Prophet. When no such help came from above, when their Carts were broken, and the Count's Army had forced in upon them, and slain Five Thousand, the rest trusted to their Heels and fled, some to *Frankbus*, others hid themselves in Woods, and convey'd themselves away, leaving their Prophet, with *Phiser* and Three Hundred more, to be taken and executed according to their Deservings. *Muncer* at his Death, could not make Confession of his Faith, he was so dejected; yet he spoke after the Duke of *Brunswick*. Now I cannot but here take Notice how Mr. *Stennet*, in his Answer to Mr. *Russen's* Tenth Chapter, shifts off the Odium of this

346 *History of the Anabaptists.*

Rebellion and mad Attempt from his Sect, with these Questions : *Is no difference to be made, between the Innocent and the Guilty ? Must the Crimes of a part be imputed to the whole ? Is there any thing in the Opinion of those who are for Adult Baptism, to dispose them to Rebellion, or other Crimes, more than in the Opinion of those who assert the Baptism of Infants ? and, Is it just to charge the greatest Sins on the most innocent Principles ?*

Before I answer these Questions, I must inform Mr. Stennet, that in every Sect or Division of Men professing Christianity, there are Three things to be considered: *First*, The Doctrines and Principles of that Sect, which makes them differ from other Men call'd by the Name of *Christians*. *Secondly*, The Persons professing to embrace and maintain such Principles, and are known by such a Denomination agreeable to such Doctrines and Perswasion. *Thirdly*, A Spirit that influences the Professors of that Division and Sect, approves of and flatters them in their Opinion, whether it be Orthodox or Heretical. This Observation is grounded upon the Advice of St. John, Ep. 1. ch. 4. ver. 1. *Believe not every Spirit, but try the spirits, whether they are of God ; because many false prophets are gone out into the world.* And upon St. Paul's Information, 1 Tim. 4. 1. *The spirit speaketh expressly, that in the latter times some shall depart from the faith, giving*
beed

heed to seducing spirits, and doctrines of Devils, &c. Therefore there is a Blessed Spirit of God, which leads his true Church and Elect into all Truth, and there are evil and pernicious Spirits of Heresy and Error, that possess the Minds of Men, and blind their Understandings, and govern their Wills; so that they are not able to see, repent, and forsake their Mistakes.

If any inquire what Spirit rules amongst the *Anabaptists*, and is proper to that Sect, I must freely declare my Mind, That it is a *Perverse, Imperious, Insolent Spirit* of Satan, the Enemy of Mankind; a Spirit of Delusion, Error, and Mischief; a Spirit of Schism and Division, not contented to perswade its Followers to separate and apostatize from Christ's Church, but also to separate amongst themselves, for the least difference in Opinion: And their several Congregations are so many Divisions and Separations. Now this Evil Spirit of *Anabaptism* has Seven wicked Spirits its Associates: 1st, a Spirit of *Hypocrisy*, which appears in their affected Behaviour, counterfeiting Sweetness and Charity, while in their Hearts they harbour nothing but Malice and Revenge. 2^{dly}, A *Conceited Spirit of Pride*, that pretends to understand the Will of God better than all the Churches of Christ, and that prompts so many *Ignorant Fellows* to presume to, and invade the Ministerial Function. 3^{dly}, A Spirit of *Embusiasm*, which discovers it self in

348 *History of the Anabaptists,*

in many of them, particularly in a certain Teacher in *Southwark*, who affirms that he was commanded to be dipped by an Angel that appeared to him. 4thly, A Spirit of *Ingratitude*, as in the old Generation of *Vipers*, that labours to destroy the Church of *England*, and undermine and blow up its Ministerial Function and Government, that hath granted to it a Toleration. 5thly, A Spirit of *Unjustice and Robbery*, that would, if it had power, deprive all Persons of other Perswasions of their Civil Rights and Estates. 6thly, A Spirit of *Confusion, Cruelty, and Rebellion*; for tho' in their Confession of Faith they profess Obedience to the Magistrates, their Practices have been rebellious in foreign Countries, and in this Land in the rising of the *Fifth-Monarchy Anabaptists*, and at the Invasion of the Duke of *Moumouth*. 7thly, A blind, stiff-necked, and Jewish Spirit, obstinate in its Perswasion, not inclinable to Repentance, but wilfully running on in the broad Road of Eternal Damnation.

Now to answer Mr. *Stennet's First Question*. As Faults and Crimes are personal, our Law condemns no Man till he is actually in Rebellion, tho' his Principles may incline him to a Revolt.

To the *Second*, The Crimes of a part may be imputed to the disgrace of the whole, tho' not the Punishment; because they entertain the same Principles and Spirit that prompted

prompted the part to the former wickedness.

To the *Third*, There is in the most part of the Persons, tho' not in the bare Opinion of those who are for Adult Baptism, a rebellious Spirit, a Spirit of Mischief and Confusion, that disposes them to act over again the same Crimes, were they not restrain'd by the power of the Laws and Government, as I shall make it appear.

To the *Fourth*, He supposes his Principles to be innocent; which we have proved to be pernicious, and as those Principles in others of the same Sect, have been active to the Destruction and Disorder of Lawful Governments and Mankind, we cannot look upon them with the same favourable Aspect as Mr. Stennet doth.

In quoting Bishop Jewel's *Apology* against Harding, he condemns his Sect, for they were Enemies of Luther, as Mr. Stennet and his Party are of our Church of England. Whatever the rebellious Boors of Germany pretended against the Cruelty and Tyranny of their Lords, the perswasion of Christ's temporal Reign, and the wicked Principles which their *Anabaptist Teachers* instill'd into their Minds, inflam'd their Zeal to assault their lawful Governours; and tho' many of them may have been of other perswasions, their chief Leaders were *Anabaptists* long before, and they followed, and gave credit to the wicked Spirit of that Sect,
and

and to the Dreams and vain Revelations, that brought them at last to Destruction and Shame. Whereas Mr. Stennet saith, *Muncer had not Anabaptism chiefly in view; in the part he bore in this popular Commotion appears in that he died in the Communion of the Church of Rome.* I answer: 'Tis certain, Religion is often pretended by Deceivers, when they have least regard to the promotion of it; but that he died in the Communion of the Church of *Rome* is not likely, for he could make no Confession of Faith without a Noble Instructor, the Duke of *Brunswick*, who taught him what he should say.

This popular Commotion in *Germany*, in which the *Anabaptists* had a principal hand, cost the Lives of several Thousands, persuaded by them to their assistance, to establish Christ's temporal Reign on Earth, in which the Saints, that is, those of their Sect only, were to bear Rule and Flourish. It was then suppress'd by the Execution of the Offenders; but their poisonous Doctrines spread amongst the inferior People in divers parts of *Germany* and *Holland*. *Melchior Hopman*, a Person of some Learning, pretending himself to be *Elijah*, divulged his Errors at *Strasburg*; but he was by the Magistrates and Bishop confin'd to a Prison, and his Disciples scatter'd. But their Punishments discourag'd not some bold Spirits to tamper with the ignorant Vulgar, and

and infect them with the same Principles. When their Numbers increas'd, they resolv'd to begin their Empire at *Munster*, about *Anno Domini* 1533; for that purpose there came to that City one *John Buckold*, a Botcher of *Leyden*, follow'd by a great Number of his Fraternity out of *Holland*. At their arrival they kept private Conventicles, and gather'd to them as many as they could perswade to their Sect, and to be Baptized again. The Magistrates being jealous of their desperate Resolutions and Designs, banish'd them out of the City; but their Party amongst the meaner sort being numerous, they were received in again, notwithstanding the Prohibition of the publick Authority. Their Excuse was, *That they must not forsake God's Cause*. The Gospel had been there Preach'd and received one year before, by many of the Citizens, when this subtil Fellow, *John of Leyden*, came to that Town. To gain Credit he consoorted first with the Preachers of the Reformation; but after he had prevail'd upon many to dislike Infant-Baptism, he forsook them, and derided their Doctrine. The Landgrave of *Hesse* sent amongst them *Fabricius* and *Bernard Rotman*, Preachers of the Reformation, and others, to discover to them their Errors, 1534. and perswade them to an Agreement about Matters of Religion. To *Rotman's* Sermons, there was one *Hermannus Sutor*, a Cobler, a constant Auditor :

ditor: This Fellow declared himself to be a Prophet, the *Messiah*, the Saviour of the World, &c. He was as debauch'd in his Morals, as blasphemous in his Profession: this Man began publicly to oppose and ridicule the Preachers Sermons, and the Subject of Infant-Baptism, and to join with *John Buckold* in opposition to that Doctrine. They declin'd a publick Disputation, which was offer'd to them by the Evangelicks, and acted more privately in their Designs, drolling and jesting at all the Arguments brought to vindicate the Truth and Orthodox Perswasion. Divers of the Magistrates, and amongst the rest the Preacher *Bernard Rotman*, was perverted by them. They became so numerous, that one of their Prophets dared to run about the City crying, *Repent and be baptized again, lest the Wrath of God fall upon you.* They ventur'd afterwards to break open Houses, to plunder the rich Citizens, and to threaten to kill all that were not Re-baptized. This alarm'd the Protestant Party, who gather'd themselves together in that part of the Town that is named *Over Water*, where they stood upon their defence, till this Agreement was concluded between them: That all Parties should enjoy the liberty of their Religion, without any Compulsion. By this means they gain'd time to send to their Friends and Adherents round about in the neighbouring Villages, with speed to come to

Munster,

Munster, to the assistance of a Great Prophet, who promised them from God wonderful Advantages, That he would shew them the right Way of Salvation, and enrich them with the Spoils of the ungodly. These glorious Promises perswaded all the Idle, indigent, Lazy, and Vagabond Persons, to flock in great Companies to the City; so that in few days it was full of those Strangers, by which means it was at the Devotion of the *Anabaptists*. As soon as they saw their Strength so considerably increased by such Numbers, they began first by the burning of *St. Maurice's Church*, next they took possession of the Magazine of Arms and Ammunition; they proceeded to pillage and demolish other Churches; they ruin'd the Colleges, burnt a great Library, and at last drove all the Protestants out of the Gates, threatening them with Death, as wicked Persons, if they did not speedily depart. Those pious *Anabaptists*, who at the first behaved themselves humbly, and pretended nothing but Religion, Justice and Equity, nothing but Meekness, Charity, and Complacency, now, when power was in their Hands, broke through all the Rules of Humanity, and were ready to cut the Throats of them who had harboured them, and who were not of their Persuasion. Let the World judge if these Practices of the *Anabaptists* agree with Innocent

354 *History the of Anabaptists!*

nocent Principles, for by their Works they are to be known.

After this Expulsion of the Protestants *John of Leyden* awakes out of a Dream, in which he had continu'd Three Days, he pretended to be Dumb, and made Signs for a Writing-Table: In which he signified to them, That it was the Will of the Heavenly Father, that Twelve Men, by him then nominated, should be Governours of the City; That every Man should have liberty to enjoy more Wives than one; and afterwards he swore upon the Gospel, that this Doctrine was revealed to him from Heaven. Those who opposed this Motion he punish'd with Death; order'd the other Prophets to preach up *Polygamy*, as a Doctrine acceptable to God. He immediately married Three Wives, and all the Holy Brethren made haste to chuse for themselves the most Beautiful Women, with whom they Bedded without any Ceremony.

The next Motion that was made from Heaven, was that of *John Matthias*, a Baker of *Harlem*, who in God's Name declared That every Man upon pain of Death should bring forth all his Gold, Silver, and rich Movables, into the publick Treasury, where they had laid before the Spoils of them who had been banish'd. This Prophet proclaim'd also, that it was God's Will that all Books should be burnt but the

ible, in a publick Fire kindled for that purpose; and when a Citizen disliked his revelation, *John Matthias* kill'd him. Some time after, in a frantick manner he took Pike and sallied out of the Gates to encounter with the Enemy, crying out to the Citizens, That he was commanded by God the Father, to drive them out of their camp; but the first Soldier he met slew him.

Another Prophet, *John Thuscocurer*, summoned the Congregation together, and affirm'd, That it was God's Command, That *John of Leyden* should be King of the World; That he should sit upon the Throne of King David; That he should kill all Kings, Princes, and Governours; destroy the wicked, and promote the People that loved Righteousness. This revelation was immediately obeyed, and *John of Leyden* proclaim'd King of *Sion*; with great Acclamations of the People, whoarken'd to such Delusions and Lyes.

The New King appear'd in much State and Splendor in Royal Attire, made out of the Church's Copes and Vestments, with Attendants suitable to Majesty; his Horses had their Trappings of Gold and Silver; before him march'd Two young Men, the one bearing before him a *Bible*, the other a Sword. The Officers of his Court waited upon him, and himself wore a great Chain of Gold with this Motto engraven upon it: *Rex Justicie hujus Mundi*: The King of Righte-

356 *History of the Anabaptists.*

Righteousness of this World. After him his Guards and Pensioners follow'd. Three times a Week he sat upon his Throne, to hear Causes: Under him sat *Knipperdoling* Governour of the City, and a little lower were his Four Counsellors. His Sentence were obeyed without controul, none daring to offend or contradict him. It happen'd that one of his Wives (he having then Married 153) had committed some offence, for which he was resolv'd to punish her, he brought her into the Market place with all the rest, commanded her to kneel down upon the Ground, and with his own Hand cut off her Head in the sight of a great concourse of People. The offence, as 'twas reported, was for questioning the Truth of his Divine Revelations, and that she did not believe that it was the Will of God that Men should be kept up there and starv'd. After Execution he made the rest of his Wives Dance about her, and gave Thanks to the Heavenly Father, applauding his Justice for fear of the same Fate.

At another time *Thuscocruer* the Prophet came to the King sitting in State upon his Throne cover'd with Gold, with this Message: *Thus saith the Lord, Go and say to the King of Sion, that he prepare my Supper in the Church-yard of the Great Church.* Accordingly under the Notion of a Communion Feast was prepared of Three Courses. While he was at Table notice being brought to

him of one of the Besiegers taken Prisoner, he rose from the Company, and went and beheaded him as a Traytor. At his return, with his bloody Hands, he took upon him to administer the Communion, and caused his Queen, the chief of his Wives, with his Officers, to deliver the Cup with these Words : *Take, eat and drink, and shew forth the Lord's Death.* After Supper, the same Prophet delivers another Message to King John : *Thus saith the Lord, Chuse Men among my People, to send to the Four Quarters of the World, to teach all Nations the way of Righteousness, and to bring them by the Spirit of their Mouths into my Sheepfold, to do Wonders among the Nations, and to publish my wonderous things among strange People.* Eight and Twenty were nominated, of whom *Thuscocurer* the Prophet was one, and they were sent out by night as *Apostles* to the several Cities, to cry in the Streets, *Repent, or else you shall be shortly destroy'd.* They were all apprehended by the several Magistrates, and put to Death, to punish them for their Presumption and Folly. The City in the mean while was closely besieged by Count *Waldeck*, and in want of all Necessaries, Famine made them feed upon Dogs, Cats, Rats, Mice, &c. This moved the Princes of the Empire from the Diet of *Coblents*, to write to the Citizens to surrender themselves; and *Hilversum*, one of their Prophets, being taken Prisoner, sent

sent them a most pathetick Letter, to represent the hainous Crimes that they were guilty of, and how they had been deceived by a Crew of Fanatick Villains, who had violated all Laws Humane and Divine. But the King understanding of the Discontent of the People, weary of his Government and their Sufferings, made a Speech to encourage them to hold out, telling them *It did become them, who were born again by new Baptism, to be more patient in the Cause of God; That he was able to send them Mann and Quails from Heaven; That he had great Troops coming with Provisions and Relief from Holland; And that at Easter, they should be deliver'd from the Siege.* But this Prophecy proving false, Fifty Persons attempting to get in Prince Waldeck's Army were cruelly put to Death by this King John; nevertheless some of the Citizens got out to the Bishop and the Prince, and having Articled for the safety of themselves and the most innocent Party, they surrender'd the City into the Hands of the Besiegers notwithstanding all the Resistance of King John and the Anabaptists, who were kill'd where-ever they were taken, in Holes and Corners whither they had fled. The King Knipperdoling, and others, were seized, condemn'd to dye as Traytors, and executed in this manner: They were tied to several Stakes, and their Flesh was pinch'd off from their Bodies with red hot Pincers by de-

rees, and afterwards run through the Bo-
dy with a Sword. Three of their Car-
casses were hung upon the high Steeple of
St. Lambert, in Iron Cases. Rotman de-
spairing of Mercy run in amongst the
soldiers, and was there by them kill'd
fighting. The City was taken after Eighteen
Months Siege, in June, 1535. This was
the End of the first King of the *Anabaptists*.
As they aim'd at an Universal Monarchy,
they had projected to surprize divers other
Cities besides *Munster*; for that purpose
John Geles was dispatch'd to *Amsterdam*, to
publish to the People the wonderful Ad-
vantages of the New Kingdom of Righte-
ousness at *Munster*, their Liberty of living
upon the Spoils of Churches, and of the
Wicked, the great Designs of their King
John, and of the Prophecies, and likelihood
of the increase and enlargement of his
Dominions. At their Religious Meetings,
instead of Divine Meditations, they were
entertain'd with the rebellious purposes of
robbing the Churches; of taking from the
ungodly their Riches and Wealth; and how
easy and feasible an Enterprize it was, to
become Masters of the City of *Amsterdam*,
which God design'd to give to their King
John, as the first fruits of his Dominion o-
ver the World. To compass this Design,
they resolved to kill all the Magistrates in
their *Town-house*, when they should be
feasting; to seize upon the Gates and
Strength

Strength of the City, and Plunder it. The Signal for their Rising was the Ringing the Town Bell, which could not be done, because a Drunken Fellow had taken away the Rope. This disappointed their Design which was discover'd by some of their Companions; so that the Enterprize being not of God, but of Satan, the Author of all Error and Mischief, came to naught and the guilty *Anabaptists* received from the hand of Justice their deserved Punishments.

These Executions discourag'd not this Sect from chusing another King of their expected Monarchy. He with his Treasurer was taken at *Utrecht*, and condemn'd to the Fire, not only for his Usurpation of the kingly Authority and Power, but also for Murdering a Mother his own Wife, that he might more freely enjoy her Daughter; for killing a young Girl, privy to the Fact, and for robbing Churches; much of that Plate was found in his Custody.

We have also an Account from the Translation of *Ch. de Nielles*, of another King of the *Anabaptists*, one *John Wilhemes*, an abominable Wretch, whose facinorous Deeds are there recorded. To him flock'd all those who had escap'd from the Siege of *Munster*. He removed his Residence from place to place, for fear of a discovery; sometimes he lived at *Louvain* or *Wesel*, at other times at *Alden*, *Calker*, and *Harlem*; He

He came to a fearful End, and was deservedly Executed. This Fanatick King affirm'd the Doctrine of the *Anabaptists* preach'd at *Munster*, was the Divine Truth, only able to bring Men to Salvation ; and that God for his demure and austere Life, had favour'd him with clearer Revelations than to other Men.

To him succeeded *Cornelius Appleman*, who was likewise punish'd by Death at *Utrecht*.

After him, *John Cordwainer* took upon him to be a King of this Innocent and Holy Sect of the *Anabaptists*. He was Executed at *Brussels*, for Robbing Churches, and Plundering the ungodly ; for this was the general persuasion of all the false Prophets of this Sect, which they endeavoured to instill into all their Followers, That it was lawful for the Saints to take the Possessions and Estates of the Wicked from them ; and that none ought to bear Rule or Authority but themselves. All this, and a great deal more of their infamous Pranks, are recorded in the Writings of *Sleidan*, *Bullinger*, *Hortensius*, *John Gastius*, and others, who have transmitted their Deeds to Posterity.

Gastius informs us, That the *Anabaptists* spread themselves in *Switzerland*, and infected many Families in the *Canton of Zurich* : But in regard they were so fond of Dipping, that Senate condemn'd their chief Teachers to be drown'd in the Rivers and Ponds, where they immersed their Disciples, A Punishment answerable to their Crime !

Crime! For at their first Appearance the Senate caus'd a Disputation between them and *Zuinglius*, a famous Divine, and they sat as Judges: At the conclusion they sentenced the *Anabaptists* to be in the Wrong, and the *Padobaptists* to be in the Right; Therefore they commanded them to desist from spreading their pernicious Errors, while they continued in that Country.

Now Mr. *Stennet* endeavours to weaken the Testimony of these approved Authors, and to shift off the Odium of the black Deeds, that this Sect in its Infancy was guilty of, from the Name of the *Anabaptists*, and from such of them as live amongst us, by the following Insinuations: That the *German Rebellion* was justly occasion'd by the grievous Oppressions of the Princes and Nobility upon the common People, and not for Religion; That the Murders, Adulteries, Sacrileges, Thefts, Robberies, Violences, and Blasphemy, and other Villanies committed by this Sect at *Munster*, were acted by the Instigation, and under the Conduct of some designing Men; That the great *Severites* practis'd against the *Anabaptists*, provok'd them to the violation of all Humane and Divine Laws, and to the Tragedies that they perpetrated; That we are to suspect these Relations of these Authors as uncertain, by reason of the difficulty of knowing perfectly the things acted in Tumults and War, and also by reason of the Prejudices of those

Prote-

Protestant Writers, who load them with Infamy, as the popish Monks did some of our Religion in the beginning of the Reformation; That several of the *Anabaptists*, as the *Menno-nites* in *Holland*, condemn and exclaim against these Violences and Insurrections, as contrary to their Principles; That many of those who suffer'd for their perswasion, had no design to rise in Rebellion; and, That the considerable Differences between those foreign *Anabaptists* and those in *England*, in Doctrine and Practice, hinders their Actions from reflecting upon these pious and innocent Souls amongst us.

To which I answer: That by the Account that we have from *Sleidan*, and the Authors of those days, the Religion, Perswasion, Revelations and Principles of the *Anabaptists*, had a principal hand both in the *German* Commotions, and the execrable Tragedies, and abominable Practices of those of *Munster*, as well as the Grievances of the People, that were by them pretended; That if that Sect were of God, no designing Men could perswade the Professors to Blasphemy, Adultery, Rebellion, and to the publick Contempt of God and his known Laws; That no Severities have been acted upon those *Anabaptists*, only for their bare Perswasion by any *Protestant Princes*, but by the *Papists*, and by their instigation, for which the former are not accountable; That no Persecution, never so cruel, ought or could perswade the true Followers of Christ, to such black Deeds as are charg'd upon the *Anabaptists* at *Munster*;

That their Proceedings in that City were so publickly known, that probably they could not be wrong'd in the Relations, that have been publish'd of them; That such Persons as have transmitted to Posterity their facinorous Deeds, were Men not govern'd by Passion and Prejudice, as the *Popish Monks* and *Fryars* were, neither did they write their *Chronicles* from uncertain Reports of others, but from their own knowledge, being Eye-witnesses to many of their Actions; and, That these Authors were Men of Reputation and Credit. That tho' some may be asham'd of such Wickedness, and their more regular Professors may be averse to such Doctrines, the Infamy remains upon all those who hold the same rebellious Principles, that prompted them to those abominable Practices. And that the Differences between those Foreigners, and many of ours at home in Perswasion and Principles are very inconsiderable, as we have taken notice in the Review of Mr. *Stennet's* Answer on Mr. *R's* Ninth Chapter. Therefore I must tell him, that these base and execrable Beginnings of this Sect affects all such amongst us, as are infected with the same Erroneous Tenents, and are ready to act over again the like Tragedies, if they had Opportunity and Power; for their Perswasion tends and leads them to the same Violences and Unjustices. Mr. *Stennet* pretends, that their Agreement with us in the

the Mode of Baptism by sprinkling, causes them to differ from our *English Anabaptists*, and that he might therefore with as good reason, report their Errors to the Defamation of the *Padobaptists*, as Mr. R. does it to the reproach of the *Anabaptists* in England. I answer: That this reason that he alledges to extenuate the Reflection upon him and his Party, is so far from lessening it, that it encreases and aggravates the Reproach: For if those Men of the *Anabaptists*, who differ'd from the Evangelicks in but one Perswasion, were tempted to Rebellion, and such Violences against them, what sort of Treatment might we expect from our Countrymen, who differ from us in more? who look upon us as Infidels? and declare us to be no Christians? But 'tis not by the Modes of Dipping or Sprinkling, that they were ever guilty of those hellish Practices of the Foreign *Anabaptists*; but their requiring all Men and Women to be baptized into their Sect, their Belief of Christ's temporal Reign, and that all ungodly Persons, *i. e.* all who own'd not their Sect, or were not joyn'd to it, ought to be dispossessed of their Wealth and Estates, and to be destroy'd, and that Authority and Dominion belong'd only to their Saints. These Tenents furnish'd them with a lawful Pretence, as they conceived to make Insurrections, and to new model the Church and the Humane World, according to their wild and fanatick Fancv.

And Mr. Stennet seems to approve of these Principles, by quoting Mr. R's recounting amongst the absurd Positions of the *German Anabaptists*, That no Person who is not a true Christian, ought to be tolerated in the Church. He adds, But he is not pleased to tell us, wherein the absurdity of it lies. Is not this the innocent Position of our home *Anabaptists*? Don't they by declaring our Baptism a Nullity, exclude us from the Church of Christ, rank us amongst Heathens and Infidels, deny us any Right to the Redemption of Christ, and tell us in implicit Terms, that we are no true Christians, neither to be tolerated in the Church of God, nor in the Kingdom? What is the Consequence of these innocent and harmless Principles of this pernicious Sect? but Rebellion against the Government, and the Overthrow of the Civil Authority of the Nation, that is under the same Condemnation as the Church of God amongst us, that they have already abjur'd. If ever Opportunity should favour them, they would act here the same Tragedies as in *Germany*, and shake off all respect to our Governours and Government, as they have done to the *Ecclesiastick Authority* establish'd in this Nation, notwithstanding their Confessions of Faith, and Oaths of Allegiance; for we find the same evil Spirit of Disorder and Confusion reigning amongst many of these demure *Hypocrites*, as I shall prove

History of the Anabaptists. 367

prove in the following Relation, of the Proceedings of this Sect, since their first arrival into *England*; therefore our Countryman Mr. *Sidenham*, had great reason to say, *Anabaptism hath been always ominous, and of a wonderful strange Influence, accompanied with the most dangerous Retinue of Errors, since the first Embrio of it was brought forth: Whether from a Judgment of God, or from its natural and secret Connexion, with other Principles of Darknes, God hath shewed on it, in every Nation where it hath prevailed, some black Characters.*

Their first coming into *England* was about the year 1535. when some fled out of *Holland*, after they were disappointed of their rebellious Designs upon *Amsterdam*. Here they were conceal'd for a while, till A. D. 1538. These *Dutch Sectaries* endeavouring to draw to their Opinion some of the Inhabitants, they were discover'd to the Ecclesiastical Courts, and condemn'd to recant, and do Penance at *Paul's Cross*; Four of them stood there publicly, with Faggots under their Arms, on the 24th of *November*. And in the same year, on the 27th, Two who refused to abjure, were burnt in *Smithfield*. The next year, 1539, we read of Two *Dutch Anabaptists* executed in the same manner, in the Road leading from *Southmark* to *Newington*. Popery then reigning in *England*, would not suffer this Sect, but put the professors of it to Death, as all

others that were not of the *Romish* Faith. The succeeding short Government of King *Edward*, that countenanc'd all those that were against the Idolatries of *Rome*, invited over divers of this Perswasion into *England*, where they had liberty to profess their Belief without danger; but the Persecution was revived against them in Queen *Mary's* days. Mr. *Fox* makes mention of one of them a Prisoner in *Newgate* with Mr. *Philpot*, for disowning the Pope. To him that Martyr writes a learned Letter, recited in the Book of Martyrs, to prove to him Infant-Baptism, a Divine Ordinance, which prevail'd upon him to renounce his Error, and to dye in the same Faith with Mr. *Philpot*. In the Reign of Queen *Elizabeth*, 1575, at *Easter*, a Conventicle of *Anabaptists* was discover'd without *Aldgate*; Twenty-seven were taken, of whom Four recanted at *Paul's-Cross*, the 25th of *May*, and the rest were Banish'd. Their Abjuration was in these Words: *Whereas we* ——— *being seduced by the Devil, the Spirit of Error, and by false Teachers, have fallen into these most damnable and detestable Errors: That Christ took not Flesh of the Substance of the Virgin Mary: That the Infants of the Faithful ought not to be Baptized: That a Christian Man may not be a Magistrate or bear the Sword and Office of Authority: And, That it is not lawful for a Christian Man to take an Oath.* Now, by the Grace of God, and by

the Assistance of good and learned Ministers of Christ's Church, I understand the same to be most damnable and detestable Heresies, and do ask God, before his Church, Mercy for my said former Errors, and do forsake, recant, and renounce them; and I abjure them from the bottom of my Heart, protesting I certainly believe the contrary. And further, I confess, that the whole Doctrine establish'd and publish'd in the Church of England, and also that is received in the Dutch Church in London, is found true and according to God's Word, whereunto in all things I submit myself, and will be most gladly a Member of the said Dutch Church from henceforth, utterly abandoning and forsaking all, and every Anabaptistical Error.

This Abjuration was taken from these *Walloon Anabaptists*, by Doctor *Dé Laune*, my Grandmother's Father, who doubtless had been instrumental in discovering to them their abominable Heresies; he was then Minister of the Dutch Church in *Augustin-Fryars* in London, granted to him by the Favour of Queen *Elizabeth*, being descended of an Honourable and Noble Family, and one of the chief Reformers of the Church of God in the *Netherlands*, who was the first Founder of the Family that bears his Name in *England*.

Others were Convicted of the same Heresy, and Banish'd out of the Land. Some were Burn'd alive, who obstinately per-

sisted in their Error. This may seem very strange, that Protestants should inflict the Punishment of Death upon such Offenders, for their bare Belief: But when we consider the Circumstances, we shall have reason to justify the Government of Queen *Elizabeth*, from any blame in that severity; for in the year 1561, when she understood of the first arrival of these troublesome Companions into *England*, she set forth a Proclamation, to command all *Anabaptists*, and all such *Hereticks*, to avoid the Land within Twenty Days, whether they were *English* or *Foreigners*, upon pain of Imprisonment and loss of Goods. This Proclamation was dated *A. 1561*. Therefore if Men will despise and act contrary to all Admonitions of Government, they are to thank themselves for the Rigour and Punishment, for they knew what they were to expect by breaking of those Laws.

The peaceable Reigns of King *James* and King *Charles*, gave these Sectaries an Opportunity to spread their pernicious Tares amongst the common People, for they are a rampant Sect. We can hear no more of them till about the year 1642, when one *Edward Barber*, and *Lamb*, and some others, in the Beginning of our Civil War, declared a War against Christ's Church, by publishing their Impious Doctrines. About that time they challeng'd Doctor *Fearly* in *Southwark*, to a Disputation, where one

William

William Kiffin was the principal Manager on the contrary side, with Four more, of whom one was a *Scotchman*. The Doctor at that time laid their Errors open to the World in a Book since Printed, giving an Account of the Disputation. But in the year 1644, they having deluded a number of our People, they had gather'd Seven Congregations, who set forth a Confession of Faith, signed by Fifteen Persons in the Name of the rest. There were then Fifty-two Articles, whereas now they have but Thirty-two Chapters, with divers Positions then not thought upon. 'Tis observable that this Sect differs very much from the first Establishment in this Nation, and all their Conventicles agree not amongst themselves.

The Civil Wars ensuing, gave them a favourable Opportunity to spread abroad their Errors, and secretly to work upon the weaker Sex. To prevent the Mischief that they had begun, and were carrying on, Doctor *Burges* and Mr. *Bedford* publish'd Two Books in opposition to them; and Mr. *Winnel* another. They were then grown numerous in *London*, and in the Towns and Cities of *England*, having establish'd an Order and Church-Government amongst themselves, which they observe to this Day. And because about that time the *Presbyterian* Form began to be discredited, and the *Independant* was most in Vogue,

Vogue, they resolved to Form their Ecclesiastical Order, after that Pattern. And in every Congregation they appointed one whom they nam'd a *Bishop* or *Elder*, instituting at the same time some circular Persons, who should have the Authority of *Apostles* or *Messengers*, as they name them, to visit and confirm their Churches. When Mr. Baxter was at *Coventry*, one *Coxe* came thither as an *Anabaptist Apostle*, to confirm, by the imposition of Hands, all those who had been dipped again in that City. At his second coming he was clapt in Prison by the Magistrates, sensible of the Mischiefs he had done there amongst the ignorant People. He publickly declared, *That the Ministers, being unbaptized, because not dipped, were no Ministers of Christ; that it was not lawful to hear them, or to joyn with their Disciples, tho' never so godly; because they were unbaptized Persons.* Which Doctrine began to make Men look upon one another as *Pagans*; so that the Re-baptized Husband would not joyn in Prayer with his supposed unbaptized Wife. What a woful Disorder and Confusion does this Doctrine bring amongst us?

The Jesuits at that time began to spread about the Nation strange Doctrines, and finding that this Sect might serve their wicked purposes, we find divers of that Fraternity in an eminent degree, as well as lower in the Army. They had poison'd a

considerable part of it with their infectious Principles, and with their Doctrine against the Baptism of Infants. Mr. *Tombes*, a Man of Learning, was then the Chief Champion of the *Anabaptists*, as Mr. *Stennet* is now; he was about the End of the Civil Wars. Chosen Lecturer at *Bewdely* in *Glocestershire*. Then did Mr. *Marshall* and Mr. *Blake*, Two worthy Divines, publish the Defence of Infants Baptism in Print. *Tombes* preach'd against them, and said, That *Infant-Baptism* pleaded from *Circumcision*, as Mr. *Marshall* had done, was an *Heresy*, and one of the first condemn'd *Heresies* of the Church.

This Man must have a great deal of Impudence, to speak such Lyes in a Pulpit, and maintain them as Truths, before a knowing World. He had perverted in that Town about Twenty, who had been Dipped by him; but the rest of his Congregation dissatisfied with his Doctrine, desired Mr. *Baxter* to agree to a Disputation between them, at *Bewdley*, *January 1. 1649.* It continued from Ten a Clock to between Four and Five in the Afternoon; Two Reverend Divines were there present, Mr. *Boraston*, whose Son, his Successor, a worthy Divine, I have formerly known, and Mr. *Good*. The Dispute ended to the great satisfaction of the *Pedobaptists*, who were confirm'd thereby in their Religion against this pernicious *Heresy*. Mr. *Tombes* after this, continued not long at *Bewdley*, by reason

reason of the little progress that he made there amongst the People.

We find him next at *Abergaveny*, in a publick Disputation between him and Mr. *Henry Vaughan*, and Mr. *A.* assisted by Mr. *John Cragge*, the 5th of September, 1653. in *St. Mary's Church*.

About this Time the *Anabaptist* Troopers would frequently climb up into Pulpits, with their Pistols and Swords by their Sides, offer violence to the Parish-Ministers, and disturb our Assemblies. In the year 1658. Judge *Hales* being in the Circuit, as I understand, an *Indictment* was brought before him, of some *Anabaptists* who broke into a Church at the time of the Holy Communion, and interrupted the Peoples Devotions; for which he resolved to punish them severely, but his Hands were tied by the Commanding Officers in the Army; for he said it was very unreasonable, that they should crave Liberty and Toleration, who would not grant it to others. This Impediment and stopping of Justice caus'd him never to sit on the Crown-side during that Government. By this Instance let the World judge of Mr. *Stenner's* innocent Religion, Party, Principles, and Practices, how harmless they would be if they had Power.

At the same Time the *Anabaptists* were very busie in *London*, to publish abroad their wicked Opinions. *Mr. Zachary Grafton*, who

who was one of their Chief Opponents, publicly confuted their Errors. At Six a Clock Lecture in the Evening, every Sabbath day, I heard him lay open at St. Anthony's, their Mistakes. To revenge themselves upon him, they publish'd Libels to defame him, and ruin his innocent Reputation. At that Time they of the Fifth-Monarchy Per-wasion, had their Publick Meetings in London; but because they exclaim'd against the Government of the then Protector, he sent several times Troops of Horse to disturb their Conventicles, and carry away some of them Prisoners, because they were Enemies of the Publick Peace: For tho' that Government agreed with them, and countenanced them, they were disaffected to it, because they were not Dipped into their Sect.

And 'tis to be observed, that tho' in their first Confession of Faith they disapprove of the payment of Tythes, and a settled Maintenance to Ministers, divers Anabaptists were then, during the Anarchy, Beneficed in England, and took Tythes. But at the Restauration of King Charles the Second, an Act of Parliament excluded them from the Favour granted to others, upon their Conformity. Their Numbers increas'd strangely in those days, till the coming in of King Charles the Second, A. D. 1660. and the Restauration of the Government. They were numerous in divers Regi-

Regiments of Horse and Foot in the Parliament Army; in *Cromwell's* Regiment of Horse, the chief Officers were *Anabaptists*; and in *Monk's* Regiment of Foot, several turn'd to that Sect: Likewise in the Navy, *Mildmay*, *Aiscue*, and *Harman*, and other principal Officers embraced it, being infected by *Paul Hopson*, a noted Preacher in the Army, who sign'd their first Confession of Faith, and by others. 'Tis certain several *Jesuits* came over into *England* and joyn'd with the *Anabaptists* about this Time, and Preach'd in their Conventicles against the Baptism of Infants, and the Mode of Sprinkling. What good can be expected from such evil Agents, the Factors of the Pope and of the Devil, and Enemies of our Peace and Unity, let the World judge? And let our Adversaries consider, whether 'tis any Credit for them, to have such Men amongst them to promote their Perswasion, who come over with a Design to create Mischief and Disturbance, both in Church and State? Have they not reason to suspect the Principles of their Sect, when these have been lately the chief Maintainers of it in this Nation? And I am credibly inform'd, that now there be many suspected and disguised *Papists*, who Teach in the Conventicles of the *Anabaptists*?

Now at the coming in of King *Charles the Second*, and the Restoration of the Govern-

Government in Church and State, they were very much offended, and the rather because of the Restauration of the Church of *England*. Their Dissatisfaction against the Royal Family, appear'd in the Rising of the *Fifth-Monarchy Anabaptists*, the 6th of *January*, 1660. *Venner*, their Chief Leader, had sent to divers of the *Anabaptists* Meetings, to know whether they would joyn with him and his Party in that Design, to kill the King, his Brothers, and the General, and to reduce the Government to a Commonwealth, in which the Saints alone should Rule. I am told by one yet alive, that the Congregation whereof he was a Member, refused to unite with them; but they never offer'd to discover this Black Design to the Government, that had been mention'd to them. But 'tis probable that a great many of them being for Christ's temporal Reign on Earth, had promised *Venner* their Assistance, which they would not venture to give, till they saw how he succeeded in his Enterprize. He had never ventur'd with such a small Party as Forty or Fifty, to conquer the City and the Nation, if he had not had expectation of greater Recruits, from those of his own Perswasion. I find in the List of these *Fifth-Monarchy-Men*, *Kiffin*, who was at the Head of the *Anabaptists* in their Confession of Faith, 1644, and second in that of 1689. This I know, having discours'd with some
of

378 *History of the Anabaptists.*

of that Sect, that they are infected with the Heresy of the *Chiliasm*, as well as of that of the other *Anabaptists*, and it may be the most part of them are not free from this Error. Therefore we have reason to add to this Account of the *Anabaptists* Proceedings in this Nation, the *Insurrection* of *Venner*, and of his *Mad Crew*, which may appear to future Ages as a Romance, had we not been Eye-witnesses of their Bold and Rash Attempt.

After the Restauration of the Royal Family, and the lawful Government in Church and State, the *Millenary* Men, who had before formed a Project of establishing in *England* a Kingdom of their own Saints, and to destroy all that would not embrace their Perswasion and Party, were very much offended at this Revolution. They could not forbear to exclaim in their Conventicles against the publick Authority, branding it with Tyranny and Usurpation, and inflaming the Auditors with a Zeal for Christ and his temporal Reign on Earth, against the Powers of the World. The Chief of this Faction, as I find recorded, were *Feake*, *Sympson*, *Cann*, *Rogers*, *Brooks*, *Vavasor Powel*, *Cockain*; and amongst their Teachers were *Vane*, *Harrison*, *Carew*, *Kiffin*, *Patience*, *Venner*, &c. These had caus'd to be Printed divers seditious Papers full of Treason; Two were remarkable, call'd *The Valleys of Baca* and

Achor, and the *Door of Hope*: The last was written by one *Righe*. By these and other Artifices they prepared and disposed their Well-wishers for a Rising. They sent abroad their Emissaries, to draw into their Party as many as they knew or suspected to be for a Commonwealth, against Kingly Government. But by this means it was first discover'd: One of these Agents invited one *Hall*, a Porter, with whom he had been familiar in the War in *Scotland*, to drink at a Tavern in the beginning of *December*, 1660. He inform'd him that there was a great Design on Foot, for the Good of the Nation and the well affected, and that he had obtain'd for him a Commission for a Company of Foot: When the Porter enquired, For what purpose? It was answer'd by some in the Room, *We will pull Charles out of his Throne, with the rest of the Family, and have the Blood of Monk; and settle a free State again, as it was in the Little Parliament: For the Saints must Reign.* The Porter promised his Assistance; but as soon as he was dismissed, he discover'd the whole Project upon Oath to a Justice of Peace, who sent him with his Examination to the King. Upon this Information one Major *White* was taken into custody, who was prevail'd upon by the King to confess what he knew, and who were the Principal Men concern'd in this Business: He
accused

accused General *Ludlow*, and Major-General *Overton*; who in former days had said That he kept *Hull* for King *Jesus*. *Ludlow* escaped into *Switzerland*, where he continued till the coming in of King *William* but these were seized, *Overton*, *Day*, *Courtney*, Major *Allen*, &c. who all belong'd to the Army then disbanded. The Imprisonment of these Chief Leaders discouraged not the rest from their Fanatick Enterprize. On Sunday the 6th of *January*, 1660. after their Meeting and Devotions were ended they arm'd themselves in *Coleman-Street* and went to *St. Paul's-Church-yard* in the dawning of the day; they there drew up their small Party, having placed Centinels round about. One of them asking a Passenger, Who he was for? Upon his Answer, *For God and King Charles*, shot him dead upon the Place. This Murder gave the Alarm to a Party of the Trainedbands, that charg'd them; but they retreating, these Rebels march'd through *Bishops-gate-Street* out of the City, from thence to *Cripplegate*, where they came in again, and then to *Alders-gate*, where the Constable's Company being weak, upon their threatening him for the Keys, let them out. Here they proclaim'd and declar'd for King *Jesus*, and their Friends and Masters the *Regicides* on the Gates; from thence they went into *Beech-lane* where a Headborough offering to stop

thea

them, was shot dead. They retreated next to *Cain-Wood*, to give time to their Friends to come to their assistance. And 'tis to be observed, that their March was cunningly design'd through the several Streets, where those of the *Anabaptist* Party, that believed the *Millennium*, or had promised them their helping hand, had Conventicles, and did there inhabit, that they might have opportunity to joyn them. Being driven out of *Cain-Wood* by a Party of Horse and Foot, they speedily and as secretly return'd for *London*, *Thomas Venner* their Captain having assured them, *That no Weapon form'd against them should prosper, nor one Hair of their Head be touched.* This Perswasion embolden'd them to venture again in Arms the 9th of *January*, in *Thread-needle-Street*, where they forc'd to retreat a Party of the Trained-bands to their Main-guard, that march'd after them into *Bishops-gate-Street* again, where they enter'd into an Ale-house, known by the Sign of the *Helmet*, and after a sharp Dispute, Two being kill'd, and Two taken; and as many of the King's Party kill'd and wounded, their next Appearance was at *College-hill*, from whence they march'd into *Cheapside*, and so through *Wood Street*, *Venner* with a Murrion on his Head, and a Halbert in his Hand, being their Leader. Here they fought stoutly in very good order, with Two of the Trained-bands of Foot,

Foot, and with the Life-Guard, whom they forced to retreat; but the Trained-bands breaking in upon them on all sides, knock'd down *Venner*, who had received several Shots; and *Tufney* and *Crag*, Two more of their Chief Teachers, being kill'd at his side, the rest fled and dispersed themselves; but the greatest Number of them went down *Wood-Street*, firing in the Rear at a Trained band of the *Yellow* in pursuit of them; Ten of them retreated into the *Blew-Anchor* Ale-house, near the Postern, where they defended themselves till the arrival of Lieutenant-Colonel *Cox* with his Company, that surrounded the House, some getting up to the top uncover'd the Tiling, where they fired in upon the Rebels in the Garret; and others getting up Stairs, having shot down the Door, enter'd upon them. Six had been there kill'd before, another refusing Quarter was knock'd down, and shot dead. The rest being demanded, Why they call'd not for Quarter? Answer'd, That they were afraid their Fellows would have shot them, if they had desired any such thing. Their Number not exceeding Forty or Fifty, caused many to suspect, that they were promised from the several Meetings of those who embraced the same Perswasion of a *Mill nium*, a powerful Assistance. This *Heresy* had infected a great Part of the late Army, who being disbanded, they thought would doubt

doubtless joyn with them, in expectation of the great Advantages promis'd by their Teachers, who blasphemously affirm'd, *That if they were deceived, 'twas God that deceived them.*

In this Insurrection Two and Twenty of the King's People were killed, and as many of the *Traytors*. Some being taken, for refusing to discover their Names, were shot. These Twenty were arraigned at the Old Baily: *Thomas Venner*, Wine-Cooper, their Leader, *Roger Hodgkin*, a Button-Teller, *Leonard Gowler*, *Jonas Allen*, *John Pym*, *William Orsingham*, *William Ashton*, *Giles Pritchard*, a Cow-keeper, *Stephen Fall*, *John Smith*, *William Corbet*, *John Dod*, *John Eleston*, *Thomas Harris*, *John Gardener*, *Robert Bradley*, *Richard Marten*, *John Patshall*, *Robert Hopkins*, and *John Wells*. *Venner* and *Hodgkin* were first call'd who after a rambling Discourse pleaded not Guilty; but the Evidence against them was, That they did several times perswade their Congregation to take up Arms for King *Jesus*, against the Powers of the Earth; That they were to kill all that opposed them; That they had been Praying and Preaching, but not acting for God; and, That they Armed themselves at their Meeting in *Coleman-Street* with Blunderbusses, Muskets, &c. They were all found guilty by the Jury, and condemn'd to dye as *Traytors*, but *Hopkins*, *Wells*, and *Patshall* were acquitted,

384 *History of the Anabaptists.*

quitted, the Proof being not clear and positive against them. The Two first, *Venner* and *Hodgkin* were, according to the Sentence drawn upon a Sledge, on *Saturday* the 19th of *January*, from *Newgate* into *Coleman-Street* over against *Swan-alley*, where was their Meeting house. *Venner* was first Executed, dying in the mad Perswasion in which he lived. *Hodgkin* raved and cursed in his manner of Praying, calling down Vengeance from Heaven upon the King, Judges, and the City of *London*, till the Hangman was hasten'd by the Sheriff to silence him with the Halter. The rest were Hang'd in divers Streets of *London*, and their Heads and Quarters disposed of according to order.

Some time after these Executions, *John James*, by Trade a Small-coal Man, of *White-chappel*, and a Sabbatarian Preacher, in his Meeting-house was accused of treasonable Words against the King and Government, committed to Prison by a Justice of Peace, arraigned at *Westminster-Hall*, and condemn'd as a Traytor; he suffer'd the 27th of *November*, 1661. at *Tyburn*. At his Death he acknowledged his Opinion of Christ's temporal Reign, and said our Magistrates were Usurpers of that Power which was entrusted with the Saints, and confidently affirm'd the certainty of the speedy coming of Christ, and the accomplishment of the Glory of *Sion*, &c.

We may here observe, That this Sect as the rest of the *Anabaptists*, give Liberty to any Tradesmen to exercise the Office of a Teacher; That as they of *Munster*, these are to set up the Saints only to Reign on Earth, and to permit none to Govern or Rule but themselves, and such as unite with them. And 'tis suspected, That they all deny Baptism to Infants, as the rest of the *Anabaptists* do. However, I find in *Bullinger*, *Osiander*, and *Pontanus*, amongst the Errors of the *Anabaptists*, the Perswasion of these *Fifth Monarchy-men*, That before the Day of Judgment, the Church shall destroy all the wicked, and obtain a Monarchy, in which the Godly shall Reign alone.

By such Opinions and Proceedings, let the indifferent and judicious World judge what esteem we are to have of the *Anabaptists* amongst us, and of their Principles and Doctrines. However, we have ground to believe, that their Intentions are not so favourable and kind to us as they pretend, since by their Confession of Faith, they wound us in the most sensible Part of our selves; and tho' they live under the Protection of our Governours, they dare publish abroad, that they are no Christians, and deprive us all who are not Dipped, of the Honour and Privileges of our Christian Religion, upon which we value our
R selves,

selves, more than upon any earthly Enjoyment. And as they pretend and plead for Liberty of Conscience for themselves, they should be so gracious to allow it to those under whose Dominion they are shelter'd. They should consider that our Judgment and theirs do not agree, and we cannot so easily be perswaded to deprive our Infants of their Church Privileges as they are, and that we look upon Sprinkling to be sufficient, and are satisfied, that Mode of Administration answers Christ's Institution; and that to sentence Peremptorily all that are not Dipped out of the Church, not belonging to the Redemption of Christ, or to eternal Damnation, is a Doom as desperate, bold, and rash, as the Insurrection of the *Fifth-Monarchy-men* was, and as cruel and barbarous, if not worse, and more inhumane; for those intended only to take from us our Lives and Wealth, but these condemn us to everlasting Flames, and by a Barbarity not to be parallell'd, but by the Anti-christian Pride and Presumption in their Opinion, exclude us out of Heaven, and condemn us to Hell, in imitation of the *Papists*, for not being of their Sect. How innocent and charitable those Principles are, and what we are to expect from their Goodness and pretended Christianity, if they had Power in their Hands, let the World judge. We need not bring the Treasonable Practices

of their Brethren without and within the Kingdom, their Adulteries, Murders, and filthy Actions, the Disorder and Feuds of Families, to discover them in their own colours. Look into their Principles and Persuasion, there you shall find, without enquiring any further, the Devil conceal'd under the Garb of an Angel of Light; for if we add to the former evil and direct Consequences of their Principles and Doctrines, which Mr. Stennet pretends are so innocent and harmless, what we have already examin'd, the Mischiefs of depriving our Infants of their Right to Christ's Covenant and Kingdom, of their excluding them from their Entrance into it, of leaving them in the polluted State of Nature, without God and a Redeemer, and under the Empire of Satan, and without any Assurance of Mercy and Salvation, with the dismal Sequels of such Proceedings and Opinions, Can any Rational Being pronounce them to be innocent or tolerable? Is there any Sect amongst us more pernicious to the Church, more dangerous to our Salvation, more injurious to our Redeemer, and more destructive to his Interest, than this of the *Anabaptist Dippers*? And it deserves our Observation, how these *Anabaptists* in the Fifth Article of their Confession of Faith, Printed 1644. charge the Episcopal Order of those days, with-

out any just Cause, with Tyranny, and applaud their Exclusion out of the House of Lords in these Words: ——— *The Tyranny and Oppression of the Prelatical Hierarchy, which God through Mercy hath made this present King and Parliament, wonderful Honourable, as an Instrument in his Hand to throw down.* By these Expressions they declare themselves Enemies of the Episcopal Order and Function. And is this the Innocency of this Generation of Vipers, of which Mr. Stennet so often boasts. 'Tis likewise remarkable, how they have alter'd their Confession of Faith according to the Times. In the first they allow no Tithes, nor legal Maintenance to the Ministry, but such as is free, and at the pleasure of the People; but in the latter they omit that Stumbling-block, because divers of them are now Proprietors of Tithes; and they are in hopes, when their Numbers increase, to allot that Maintenance to their Teachers. Thus worldly Interest, which altogether governs this Sect, hath caus'd them to leave out this Article in their Second Confession. We may likewise observe, that their Confessions agree not, as that of 1663. presented to King Charles the Second, with Two others, that of 1678. subscribed by Fifty-four Messengers, &c. and that of 88. of the particular Baptists.

Now King *Charles* and his Council, considering how these wicked Men, under a Pretence of Religion and Conscience assembled to disturb his Government, and the Peace of the Kingdom, publish'd a Proclamation, to forbid all religious Exercises in Conventicles or Meeting-houses, other than in the Churches and Chappels appointed for that purpose, under the Penalty of being prosecuted for Rioters. For that intent he commanded all Justices of the Peace, and other Magistrates, to suppress such Assemblies, and to deal with the Offenders according to Law ; but this Prohibition, and the Severities practised against them, hinder'd them not from their wonted Conventicles, which they frequented more privately still, continuing to spread their Errors among the common People, till the Death of King *Charles*, and the Accession of his Brother King *James* to the Throne and Crown of *England*. At the beginning of whose Reign, the Duke of *Monmouth*, the Lord *Gray*, and about Eighty-two Persons more of their Followers, Landed at *Lyme*, from *Holland*. This Duke had been in his Father's days the Idol of all Dissenters, and especially of the *Anabaptists*, who were wont to magnify his Wisdom, Goodness, Courage, and other Abilities, and secretly to whisper his Right of Succession to the Crown, by reason of a pretended private Marriage of his Mother to the King. To

prevent the Danger of such Pretentions, his Majesty was forced to disclaim it publickly. However this rash Duke attempted to invade the Kingdom with his small Party, and to march to *Taunton* in *Sommerſetſhire*, where the *Anabaptiſts* and other Diſſenters increas'd his Numbers to ſeveral Thouſands in or about Ten days time. 'Tis incredible how forward they were at firſt, to Liſt themſelves under his Banners ; but when he ſuffer'd himſelf to be proclaim'd King, by an over zealous and affectionate Party, contrary to his Agreement with the Earl of *Argile*, the *Fifth-Monarchy-Anabaptiſts*, who would have none to Reign but King *Jeſus*, and the Members of their Sect, became more cool and leſs zealous for his Intereſt. From *Taunton* he march'd to *Bridgwater*, from thence, in ſight of *Briſtol*, through *Wells*, to *Phillips-Norton*. The innocent *Anabaptiſts* of his Army, committed ſeveral Diſorders in the *Cathedral* of *Wells*, they ſhot Bullets through the Organs, and were going to deface that Houſe of Prayer, had not the Lord *Gray* haſten'd to reſcue it from their ungodly and ſacrilegious Hands. At *Phillips-Norton* they were met with, by a Party of the King's Subjects and Soldiers, commanded by the Lord *Churchill*, now Duke of *Marlborough*, by the Earl of *Feverſham*, Collonel *Kirk* and others, with whom the late Biſhop *Mew* joyn'd. The Rebels were there forced to
retreat

retreat back to *Bridgwater*, being pursued by the Royalists, who pitch'd their Tents, about the 11th of *July*, *Anno Domini* 1685, in *Weston-Moor*, facing the Town of *Bridgwater*. The Camp had the Village of *Weston* in their Backs, and before them a small Ditch of Water, not fordable in Winter, but then passable on Horse-back. The Duke, in the Evening, of the Night that he design'd to beat up their Quarters, went up to the Church as high as he could, to take a View of them, and disposed of all things for an Encounter: He order'd the Lord *Gray*, who commanded the Horse, to march at the Head of his Party, and enter the *Moor*, not the strait Road, but through the Parish of *Chedsey*, a little about, all his Infantry follow'd, and were drawn up by Major *Holmes* and other Commanders. At the first Entrance into the *Moor*, one Collonel *Hucker* shot off his Pistol, which gave the Alarm unto the King's Soldiers, who were all sleeping secure in their Tents, never dreaming of a Camisade; and the Horse-men were in the Farmers Houses in their Beds, their Horses unfadled in the Stables and Barns. So that if the Duke's Horse under the Lord *Gray*, had made speed into the Town of *Weston*, they might have surpriz'd all the Horse and Horse-men, and fallen upon the Back of the Foot, and taken all their great Guns, with which they did afterwards great Execution. But

the Lord *Gray* with his Cavalry rode up and down, without striking a stroke, and left the Foot to fight the Battle. At the first beginning of the Alarm Bishop *Mew*, then elect Bishop of *Winchester*, being apprehensive of the Duke's Design was watchful, and reading in the Vicar's House of *Weston*; he quickly hasten'd to the Cannon, where, with his Coach-horses, he turn'd them from the ordinary Road, towards *Bridgwater*, towards *Chedsey* and *Monmouth's* Infantry, and gave fire to the first Gun, with this saying, *My Blessing go along with it.* The Duke's Foot stood firm while the Night cover'd them; but the Duke and the Lord *Gray* with all the Horse, being fled towards *Axbridge*, and *Mendip-hills*, and dispersed, they began to shift for themselves at the dawning of the Day. I being then an Inhabitant of that Country, I know these Particulars to be true, and that several *Anabaptists* out of *Taunton*, *Frome*, and other Places, cast themselves into the Duke's Army, and were afterwards condemn'd by Judge *Jefferys*, and Executed.

And to shew what hand that Sect had in this Tumult, and short liv'd Rebellion in and about *London*, in their Meetings they began to consult, what Assistance they should be able to give to the Duke, if he had any success. And I am credibly inform'd, that they began to make a Purse by voluntary Contributions of the wealthiest of the *Anabaptists*,

baptists, to raise Troops of Horse to help him, if Opportunity gave leave; and that their Resolution was never to lay down their Arms until their Religion was uppermost, and until they had brought the Saints to Reign alone. - But God disappointed these their glorious Designs and mighty Projects, by the rout of the Duke's Army, and the loss of his Head upon *Tower-hill*.

It may be acceptable to the Publick, if I give here a farther Account of several Particulars of this rash Invasion, in which the *Anabaptists* had a great hand to encourage it, and if it had prosper'd, they were resolved to send *Monmouth* Twenty Thousand Men to assist him, after they had computed their Strength and Numbers. Divers Passages between his Landing and Execution, deserve to be transmitted to Posterity. When the Mayor of *Lyme* saw how willing his Townsmen were to receive and welcome the Duke, he fled with the Minister, and sent word to the King of his Arrival. There was then some of the publick Money, which was taken and converted to the Duke's Use. A certain Neighbour Gentleman, more zealous for him than wise, sent to welcome him into the Land, with the Present of a fine Horse, which proved fatal to him and his Family; and to Mr. *Dare* of *Taunton*, to him and his Family; for to purchase his Pardon afterwards from King *James*, he was oblig'd to

pay to Judge *Jefferies*, then Lord-Chancellor, some Thousands of Pounds. This Horse was the occasion of the Death of Mr. *Dare*, then made Colonel of a Goldsmith, by the Duke; for contending with another Gentleman for the Horse, which had been given to him by *Monmouth*, he was shot in the Head, and died immediately.

At the publishing a Declaration against the King, which reflected much upon his Honour and Right, the Country came in to his Assistance; so that in his March, and at the first Appearance of his Men on the top of the Hills, Colonel *Lutterell's* Regiment of the Militia fled away, and could not be persuaded by their Officers to stand; for Fame had magnified the Number of the Enemies Forces, to terrify and draw the Country to his Assistance. And the Muster-Master Captain *L—t—n*, advancing before the Regiment as a Scout, discover'd some few of the Duke's Men at a distance, which caus'd him to Gallop back to his Party, crying out, *Gentlemen, save your selves, for the Enemy is coming.* At which Words they fled towards *Taunton*, and some cast away their Arms and Coats, to make their way more speedily through Corn-fields. The Duke followed them with his small Party, not above Three Hundred Men. The Lord *Gray* rid before him, with a Sword in one Hand and a Bible in the other, when they came to *Taunton*; where

where the People welcom'd him with loud Acclamations, and other Signs of Joy. A certain Quaker of the Town came to see him, with these Expressions, *Thou art come to preserve the Gospel, I hear it is not yet taken away from us ; thou art come too soon.* The People had swept their Streets, and spread sweet Herbs and Flowers in his way to Mr. *Hucker's* House, where the Duke took up his Lodging. He was to have been Commissary-General of Provisions, in his Army.

Now the flight of the Militia Regiments, and the unconcernment of the *Devonshire* Forces, under the Duke of *Albemarle*, at the March of the Duke of *Monmouth*, so encourag'd the Townsmen and Country to lift themselves, that it is confidently reported, that he had in a few days about Nine or Ten Thousand Men. The Minister and several of the Loyal Party, were fled out of Town ; and divers neighbour Ministers left their Dwellings, for fear of the Insolence and Abuses of these new raised Soldiers, who search'd all round the Country for Horses, Arms, and Ammunition, which they carried away without the Owners leave. None were more insolent and insulting than such as were of the *Anabaptist* Perswasion: One among the rest meeting a Minister going to his Devotions, offer'd to scoff at the Prayers of our Church, by saying, *I warrant you, you are now going to say, Lord have Mercy upon us.* It was

was answer'd boldly to that Wretch, *Merey* will shortly be the best thing you can desire and crave. The *Taunton* Virgins offer'd amongst the rest, to shew their Affection to the Duke, Twenty-six of them having prepared him Standards and Colours, and wrought his Name in one in Gold, with the Addition, *King of England*, carried them to him through the Town, to a Meadow near *North gate*; they were led by a Daughter of Collonel *Butter*, who had a Sword in one Hand, and a Bible in the other, and were kindly receiv'd and saluted by the Duke. But when he saw neither Clergy nor Gentry come in to him, he was discouraged; yet he was prevail'd upon to proceed on, upon Intelligence, the 20th of June, That Collonel *Kirk* with his *Tangerines* were at *Chard*, and stop'd his Retreat. It was then Sunday, and *Ferguson* was to Preach before him, as he had done the Sunday before, upon the 20th of *Deut.* 3, 4, Verses. This News made him hasten to *Bridgewater*, and from thence towards *Wells* and *Shipton-Mallet*. The Duke of *Beaufort* with a strong Party had taken possession of *Bristol*; and when *Monmouth* demanded Entrance into *Bath*, they shot and kill'd his Trumpeter that he sent. At *Canneshambridge* an unknown Hand discharg'd a Gun at the Duke, and desperately wounded the next Man to him. The King's Army met and encounter'd the Rebels at *Philips-Norton*, where the

the Duke of *Grafton* advancing with his Company unadvisedly, in a Lane lined on both Sides by the Duke's Men, lost Twenty-seven of his best Soldiers. The *Monmouthians* were in the lower Ground amongst the Hedges, where they had planted their Canon, with which they annoy'd the King's Forces, who were drawn up in a higher Ground. Tho' the Duke lost not many Men, nor near so many as his Enemies, he was here stop'd, and resolv'd to return back with all speed. As he retreated through *King Sedgmore*, he found about a Thousand Clubmen up in Arms, commanded by one *Plays*, a *Quaker*, who was invited to joyn with him; but hearing of the coming of the King's Forces, was discouraged, and dispersed his Men to their several Habitations.

The Badge and Cognizance of the Duke's Men was a Green Bough, as that of the King's was a White Paper; and the Word of distinction of the Duke's Side was, *God on our Side and no Quarter*, as on the King's was, *Whitehall and no Quarter*. The fight in *Weston Moor* between the Foot, lasted about Two Hours: In which time about Fifty were killed, besides the Wounded. As soon as the Day appeared, the Duke with a Party of Horse was fled towards *Axbridge*, and that Way up to *Mendip*, and all the Rebels dispersed. Their Carriages were taken near the *Moor* and Plunder'd. The Duke was
made

made Prisoner about *Ringwood*, and from thence, with the Lord *Gray*, convey'd to the *Tower of London*, and from thence to the Scaffold on *Tower-hill*, as the World knows. I am sensible that some of the *Anabaptists* now will deny, that their Sect had any hand in this Insurrection; but 'tis to be proved by the Number of those who suffer'd in the *West* of that Perswasion, by what Mr. *Wallin* in his *History of Infant-Baptism*, hath taken notice of their former Resolution, to assist the Duke with Twenty Thousand Men, whereof One Thousand Five Hundred were to be Horse. And 'tis an Evidence sufficient to the World, how much this Sect was concern'd in that Invasion, by a certain Book Printed by them, call'd *The Bloody Assizes*, where the Romantick Author speaks of them as Blessed Martyrs, who suffer'd for their Rebellion against their lawful Prince, and brings them into the Catalogue with those innocent Persons, who were unjustly put to Death in King *Charles's* Reign, by the violence of a prevailing Party. All, or most of their Speeches, are forged; and I can assure the World, that many of them never died with that Christian Resolution, and those pious Sentiments that are ascrib'd to them in that Book, Printed by the *Anabaptists*.

Now the Papists having an Intention to ruin the Church of *England*, and to intro-

duce

duce Popery, perswaded the King to ingratiate himself with all Dissenters, particularly with the *Anabaptists*. Unto whom he gave a plenary Indulgence, to set up as many Conventicles as they pleas'd, by his Royal Declaration for Liberty of Conscience; but that being opposed with the Abrogation of the penal Laws and the Test, by our worthy Bishops, Nobility, and Gentry, he took such unadvised Methods next, as open'd the Eyes of the Nation, and caused the following Revolution, that settled King *William* and Queen *Mary* upon the Throne, and the Succession in the Protestant Line of the Royal Family.

In the First Year of the Reign of King *William* and Queen *Mary*, an Act of Parliament granted to all Dissenters from our Church, an unlimited Toleration. This gave liberty to the *Anabaptists*, to strengthen their Party by the Accession of divers ignorant and unadvised People to their Sect, who have been perswaded to be Dipped by them, and by that Ceremony to engage themselves the more to their Interest. In the Year 1689. there was a general Meeting of them, to consult of their Affairs, and to publish a Confession of Faith, in which they agree with most of our Dissenters, but in the Subjects and Mode of Baptism. They borrow from the *Presbyterians* and *Independants*, their chief Articles,
and

and make their Separation and Churches altogether conformable to the Practice of the latter. Their Consultation continued Eight or Nine Days, from the Third of the Seventh Month to the Eleventh, 1689. as they affectedly express themselves. It seems there were the Ministers and Messengers of upwards of one Hundred Congregations in *England* and *Wales*. In this Confession they shew a Conformity in most Articles with the Orthodox Christians, yet we have reason to suspect it to be but a *Blind*, to deceive the World, and to procure a favourable Opinion to the Professors of the Dipping Sect; for many of them disagree, both in Belief and Practice, in divers Positions, with the Doctrines there set down, as in *Original Sin*, the *Christian Sabbath*, and the Civil Magistracy now establish'd, unto which many are no cordial Friends; for they would have none but the Saints to have liberty to Reign; and are of Opinion, *That Dominion is founded in Grace*. Now what Opinion are we to entertain of a Sect, that is divided into so many Heretical Perswasions, so contrary to the Being of Christianity? What Opinion are we to have of a Sect, that threatens all Men that joins not with them, with eternal Damnation, and offers to deprive us of our Right to our Honours, Command and Estates? Their Behaviour and
Carriage

Carriage amongst us, at present, is contrary to this Character. Why? Because they dare not act otherwise; their Power answers not yet their Will and Principles; the Laws of the Land, and the Authority of the Nation, keep this unruly and pernicious Sect in Awe. But by their secret Actings, by their Dealings, and overthrow of all Lawful Ministry, we may easily guess at their future Proceedings, if they had Liberty and Power: In all Parts of the Nation they spread their Infection, and increase amongst the simple and ignorant. It concerns therefore all Ministers and Magistrates, who love the Welfare of Souls, and the Preservation of the publick Peace of the Nation, to have an Eye to the secret Actings of this Sect, to put a stop to their Pride and Presumption, and to endeavour to undeceive their deluded Disciples.

This Sect now runs into the strangest Confusions and Divisions amongst themselves, according to the old Proverb, *Give some Men Rope enough, and they will hang themselves.* But that which the Government should take notice of, they have their Quarterly Meetings, and every Year their frequent general Assemblies in London, from all Parts of England, where their Numbers, Strength, and Power, is computed, and Measures taken, not only
against

against the Church of *England*, and for the propagating their Heresy, but to settle and secure their temporal Interest in the World.

'Tis likewise to be observ'd, that the Dictates and Resolutions of these Assemblies, are more absolute and imperious than the Decrees of the Pope and his Cardinals, in relation to Religion and all other secular Matters. The present contending Parties are the *Cassinites* and the *Monkists*, who borrow their Names from *Matthew Cassin* of *Surrey*, and from *Thomas Monk* of *Buckinghamshire*; at first Two intimate Friends, but fell at variance at some notice that *Cassin* took of *Monk's* lascivious Behaviour with a dear Sister, one *S—r—h J—s*. *Cassin* inform'd the next general Assembly of the Matter; but they apprehending, that if they took any Cognizance of the ill Behaviour of such an Eminent Brother, others might be question'd as irregular in their Lives, which might bring a publick Scandal upon their Sect, therefore they put a stop to this dangerous Inquisition. Now *Monk*, and his Party, to revenge themselves upon *Cassin*, oblig'd the general Assembly of 1699. to declare *Matthew Cassin* and his Disciples, to have brought a Scandal upon the Ways and People of God; That they are the Sink of Heresies and Errors, Blasphemy

Blasphemers and Idolaters; That a Separation from the Tents of those Wicked Men was necessary; That they are false Teachers, and deserve to be Hang'd and Burn'd as Traytors, &c. 'Tis worth our observation, that both Parties are erroneous, in relation to the Divine and Humane Natures of Christ, and express their Sentiments to the same purpose in different Words, *That Christ is not of the uncreate Substance of his Father; That God made him a Creature only of Flesh, Blood, and Bones, in the Virgin's Womb, not of the Flesh of Mary, but the Matter of the Word, was turn'd into Flesh in her Womb.* This is the Doctrine of the *Cassinites*, for which the adverse Party, that call themselves Orthodox, tho' as Heretical in divers Opinions, divide from them. In the Year 1696. Forty of their Jolly Bishops and Messengers, Publish'd their Mandates to all their Churches to that purpose, to forbid Communion with the *Cassinites*: Yet another Assembly *Anno Domini 1704.* declared against this Decree, and judg'd it lawful to joyn with those, against whom they had been so violent in Print, tho' they had not alter'd their Perswasion. The Reason of this great Change, was the Knowledge that some of the Heretick Party had got, of the Vile Enormities and Wicked Lives of most of the Orthodox Party.

Party. To prevent a Discovery they clap'd up an hasty Agreement, which lasted not long : For one *Jenkins*, by Trade a Weaver, accused at the next general Assembly, one *Mary Yelder*, of his Meeting-house, *For denying the Lord that bought her* ; and at the Meeting in *Goswel-street*, exclaim'd against her as an Heretick, and that he had rather have Communion with the Criminals of *Newgate* and *Bridewell*, than with such Hereticks ; tho' the Woman declar'd and proved her self to be innocent. But the Truth is, she was privy to his Life and Actions ; and that she might not be credited, he resolv'd to brand her with Heresy.

In the Year 1699. one Mr. *Chandler* and Mr. *Leigh*, had a Disputation with Doctor *Russel* at *Portsmouth*, at the Presbyterian Meeting-house, before the Deputy-Governour, the Mayor and Aldermen, about Infant-Baptism : Both Parties challeng'd the Victory to themselves ; but according to the Judgment of the Honourable Assembly, the *Anabaptists* were basely baffled by these Presbyterians. This *Russel* was accused of divers Immoralities, of which he endeavour'd to clear his Reputation, by casting Dirt upon the Meeting at *Goswel-street*, in Two Pamphlets, the one call'd *The Testimony of High-hall*, and the other from their Church at *Dean street*. Now
some

some of these People being dissatisfied with their former Creeds, have attempted to make new, as they of *Buckinghamshire*, and therefore stiled by the contrary Party, *The Buckinghamshire Creed-Makers*; and a late general Assembly have pretended to mend and alter their former Belief and Articles of Faith, which they impose upon all the Dipping-Sect, under pain of Damnation. And their Teachers exercise so absolute, despotick, and tyrannical Power over the Consciences of their deluded Profelytes, that for the least dissention from them, they proceed to Excommunication; witness the Case of *Barker* and *Downes*, lately tried in the *Queen's-bench*. One *Jenkins*, a *Weaver*, Bishop of a Meeting at *Harts-streit*, expell'd out of his Communion one Mr. *Christ. Barker*, only for desiring *Psalms* to be sung in the Congregation; and for saying, *If any Man love not our Lord Jesus Christ, let him be Anathema maran-atha*. And at his next appearance there, he was miserably kick'd and abused by one *Downes*, a *Deacon*. I will conclude the History of this abominable Sect, with some Paragraphs out of a Manuscript written by an *Anabaptist*, which I have by me, and discovers this Mystery of Satan.

They, he means their Teachers, must be believed upon pain of eternal Damnation, from

a Spirit of Pride or high Conceit of themselves, and their own Abilities, whereby they are puffed up with such a Degree of Popish Infallibility, that all that cannot see with the same Eyes as they do, must certainly be in a damnable State. A little after, Instead of being Promoters of Truth, Love, Union, and Charity, they are but as so many Incendiaries, and Promoters of continual Hatred, Envy, Malice, Discord and Division; that if such turbulent Spirits were not overpower'd by those that sit at the Stern of Government, they would certainly turn all things into such Confusion and Distraction, that no Man could quietly enjoy any thing that is his proper Right, either in Civil or Religious Matters, &c. Again, 'Tis further to be noted concerning Matthew Cassin, that his old Enemy Joseph Wright and others, as Hunt, Hore, Russel, Taylor, Hook, Garret, Mulliner, Jenkins and others, have incensed both City and Country with such partiality against him, that in the general Assembly some have been reflected upon to be Hereticks, only because they lived in the same County with Cassin.

And discoursing upon the Immoralities, and secret filthy Lives of these Deceivers, he saith, There can be no Conditions of Peace to be expected or regarded, while there remains just cause to say as Jehu did to Joram in another Case, What Peace so long as the Whoredoms of thy Mother Jezabel and her
Witch.

History of the Anabaptists. 407

Witchcrafts are so many! for it is certain that nothing but Confusion and Distraction would be the Issue and Consequence of uniting with such turbulent and ungovernable Spirits, &c. Again, the same Author saith, These Orthodox Pretenders seem to be so fond of having and keeping Church-Communion to themselves and their own Party, because in their own Conceit they are sound in the Faith above others. But this is all a Jest, or that which is worse, down right Hypocrisy and Baseness; for if any do but countenance their Arbitrary Proceedings, account their Preachers Orthodox, and treat them with kind Entertainments and grateful Presents, that will sufficiently atone for Heresy or Immoralities; and of this 'tis well known many Instances might be given, &c. A little after he saith, Their Dismal and Black Charges and Accusations, are cover'd over with the fine and specious Pretences of Humbly beseeching in the Bowels of Christ, to promote this Blessed Reformation, i. e. their Heretical Sect, for the Honour of God, the Majesty of their Redeemer, the Purity of the Churches, and this very much resembles a poysoning Pill, which inwardly contains nothing but Death and Destruction, &c.

I have transcrib'd all this out of the aforesaid Manuscript, written by a Zealous Anabaptist, who discovers at large there

408 *History of the Anabaptists.*

there the Devilish Hypocrisy, Rage, Malice, Wickedness, and Immoralities, of their Principal Teachers. This will suffice to expose to the publick View, the Nature and Designs of this Pernicious Dipping-Sect.

FINIS.

ERRATA.

Page 13. l. 14. read Tense. p. 84. in the Hebrew instead of a Mem, r. a Teth, Tabal Tebilah p. 125. l. 31. r. 243. p. 135. l. 15. r. Sex. p. 186 l. 28. r. instruction, and l. 31. r. Eight Days old p. 356. l. 10. r. 15. instead of 115. *Other Faults of the Press may easily be corrected by the Judicious Reader.*

Ma-
of
uf-
the
ous

ebrew
ebilah
p. 186
s old
of th
der.